

to add insult to injury, it is United States Government cargoes which are making possible such profiteering by foreign-flag ship operators.

I have sought, Mr. Speaker, to correct the situation. Earlier this year I introduced a bill to force our foreign competition, if it accepted our United States Government cargoes, to pay our scale of wages. Unfortunately, there has not been widespread support to date for that type of solution which is patterned after the Davis-Bacon area labor standard provision used in Federal construction and other legislation.

Meanwhile, the problem of foreign steamship profiteering has become more aggravated and, accordingly, I have developed a new legislative approach which offers, I think, a more practical remedy. This new idea is incorporated in H. R. 12078, a bill which I introduced yesterday and to which I call all Members' attention.

As the membership knows, Mr. Speaker, under the United States Cargo Preference Act, or, as it is generally referred to, the 50-50 cargo law, American ships to qualify for any preference must be

available and agree to transport the cargo at reasonable rates. My bill provides, in effect, that foreign-flag vessels to qualify must have rates that are in line with the rates charged by American-flag ships so that the margin of profit of the former is not greater proportionately than the margin of profit of our privately owned commercial oceangoing ships for comparable service in comparable geographic areas, such margins of profit being based on determinations of the Secretary of Commerce, taking into account wage differentials.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation is fair and would accomplish three desirable objectives: First, American shipowners would be discouraged under such a provision of law from transferring their vessels to foreign registry by reducing their profit incentive; second, the bill would relieve the United States Treasury and the poor long-suffering taxpayers of this country of paying exorbitant transportation and profits to operators of foreign ships; and, third, the measure would expand our active American merchant marine and increase job opportunities for American seamen.

My purpose in introducing H. R. 12078 at this late date in the session is to allow time for study and Department reports, so the House Committee on Merchant Marine could give the bill early attention next year. At the moment there is considerable demand for cargo and passenger space, so that our seafaring personnel may not be too concerned or fully conscious of future unemployment possibilities. But if the American people come to a realization that in a measure they are subsidizing not only our merchant marine but the ships of other nations and ships flying foreign flags, then there is a danger of a popular move to cut off Government assistance of every nature and to all. In effect, our United States ships are being driven off the seas right now and indirectly and in a large measure it is our own Government cargoes transported on foreign ships which are causing this situation.

Let us stop this profiteering before it boomerangs. H. R. 12078 may well hold the answer to the problem.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 4, 1956

Rev. Rafe C. Martin, pastor, St. John's Presbyterian Church, Reno, Nev., offered the following prayer:

Not with ponderous words nor phrases of piety, Almighty God, but with simplicity of mind and humility of heart we seek Thy blessing, for the people of this Nation in general, and especially for the Senate here assembled; that Thou wouldst be pleased to direct and prosper all their consultations, to the advancement of Thy glory, the safety, honor, and welfare of the people; that all things may be so ordered by their endeavors, upon the best and surest foundations, that peace and happiness, truth and justice, virtue and piety may be established among us.

These and all other necessities for them and for us, we humbly ask in the name of Jesus Christ, the Ruler of all. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 31, 1956, was dispensed with.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 31, 1956,

The following reports of the Committee on Appropriations were submitted on June 1, 1956:

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 9720. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957,

and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2093).

By Mr. STENNIS:

H. R. 10003. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2094).

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On May 28, 1956:

S. 2286. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 so as to provide for the utilization of privately owned shipping services in connection with the transportation of privately owned vehicles;

S. 2327. An act for the relief of Takako Iba; and

S. 3237. An act to provide for continuance of life insurance coverage under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, in the case of employees receiving benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

On May 29, 1956:

S. 1883. An act for the relief of Pietro Rodolfo Walter Stullin and Renate Karolina Horky.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 9852. An act to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 10285. An act to merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks, to provide for retirement of

Government capital in Federal intermediate credit banks, to provide for supervision of production credit associations, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 9852. An act to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 10285. An act to merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks, to provide for retirement of Government capital in Federal intermediate credit banks, to provide for supervision of production credit associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business for action on nominations on the Executive Calendar under the heading "New Reports."

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States, submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar under the heading "New Reports" will be stated.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGES

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles E. Whittaker to be United States circuit judge, eighth circuit.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of David T. Lewis to be United States circuit judge, 10th circuit.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for postmasters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations for postmaster be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations for postmasters will be considered en bloc, and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of all nominations today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a limitation of 2 minutes on statements made during the morning hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NIHAT CENGIZ AND OTHERS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1026) for the relief of Nihat Cengiz, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bonds, which may have issued in the cases of Nihat Cengiz and Rudolf Fritz Liermann. From and after the date of the enactment of this act, the said Nihat Cengiz and Rudolf Fritz Liermann shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, John Soudas, Catherine Callimanopoulos, Mary Callimanopoulos, Guiseppi Castrogiovanni, Anna Castrogiovanni, Stefano Castrogiovanni, Pil Nyi Kwak, Albino Braiuca, Liu Yuen Chuang, Lin

Tsai, Kimiko Yamada Clark, Leopold Riedl, Bozena Riedl, Hisakazu Hozaki, and Georgina Feher shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this section of this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, David Hayes, Nenita Santos, Elizabeth Santos, George Henry MacDonald (formerly Frederick William Arthur), and Catherine Toews shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mary Parlich Goldstein shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of certain aliens."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on February 3, 1956, the Senate passed S. 1026, to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to the beneficiary. On May 21, 1956, the House of Representatives passed S. 1026, with amendments, to include the beneficiaries of 17 similar individual Senate bills. Two cases, which have been included in S. 1026, passed the Senate to grant permanent residence to the beneficiaries, but have been amended to provide only for cancellation of outstanding deportation proceedings in behalf of the beneficiaries.

The amendments are acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 1026.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

EVA GERSHBEIN RUBINSTEIN AND OTHERS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1244) for the relief of Eva Gershbein Rubinstein, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eva Gershbein Rubinstein and Lydia G. Dickerson may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That suitable and proper bonds or undertakings, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maximilien Beauvois may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found

to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lina Dias (formerly Lena Reeg) may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Katina R. Landrum and Renza Marsale Bartlett may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (17) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonio Rubi Mendiola may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 6. The exemptions provided for in this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on March 29, 1956, the Senate passed Senate bill 1244, to waive a ground of inadmissibility in behalf of the beneficiary. On May 21, 1956, the House of Representatives passed Senate bill 1244 with amendments to include the beneficiaries of six similar individual Senate bills.

The amendments are acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate bill 1244.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am pleased to inform the Senate that we are well ahead of schedule this year on appropriation bills for the next fiscal year. Three bills have become public law, 3 bills are in conference, and 4 are currently on the Senate Calendar.

Two of the bills on the Senate Calendar, H. R. 9720, for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare; and H. R. 10003, for the District of Columbia, will be taken up tomorrow.

H. R. 9739, for the independent offices, and H. R. 9536, for general Government activities, are ready for floor consideration as soon as the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] returns to the city this week.

The appropriation bills for the Department of Defense and for Public Works are expected to be reported next

week. After that there will only be the legislative, mutual security, and supplemental bills for 1957 remaining to be reported by committee and acted upon by Congress.

I am confident that all of our money bills will be completely finished by the end of the current fiscal year, and I wish to commend the Committees on Appropriations in both the House and the Senate, particularly the eminently capable chairmen, Representative CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, and Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, as well as their able staffs, for the fine work they have done this year. I am also always pleased to extend my deepest appreciation for the splendid cooperation that I have received from every Member of the Senate in the scheduling and handling of appropriation legislation on the floor.

It is the hope of the leadership that the report on the social-security bill from the Finance Committee will be filed with the Senate not later than tomorrow, in which event it is the intention of the leadership to proceed to the consideration of the social-security bill, with the understanding that from time to time unanimous consent of the Senate will be asked to lay that bill aside and take up appropriation bills or other bills which require immediate attention.

I want to give Senators as much notice as possible, because I feel deeply in their debt for the very excellent cooperation I have received from the leadership on the other side of the aisle, and from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator anticipate that the social-security bill will be voted on this week?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should not like to make any definite commitment. If I should, the Senator knows I would try to keep it. Probably some 50 or 60 amendments will be offered to that bill. If it is reported on Tuesday and taken up for consideration on Wednesday, we shall probably have general discussion of it on Thursday and Friday, and perhaps more discussion on Monday, and it may be Monday before there will be any votes on the bill. I should think it would take part of next week to finish action on it, but the Senator from Vermont has had more experience in the Senate than I have had, and he can judge for himself.

The clerk tells me fifty-odd amendments have been submitted to the social-security bill. How many of them will be pursued, I do not know. I think it is a good guess to say there will be no votes on the bill this week.

Mr. AIKEN. I asked the question because of a selfish interest. I have to be out of town the latter part of the week, and I hoped there would be no votes taken on the bill this week.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Vermont is never selfish. I do not think he will miss any votes on the social-security bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I believe the acting majority leader last Friday mentioned the fact that the Alaska mental health bill will be brought up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. So far as the majority leader's information goes, he thinks it is one of the bills which have been cleared for consideration. Does the Senator have any wishes in the matter?

Mr. LANGER. I have a wish. I should like to have it lie over a day or two, pending an investigation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator's wishes will be complied with, and we shall put it over right now.

Mr. LANGER. For a day or two?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. Let us say for 2 days.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We shall be delighted to do so. We shall delay it today and tomorrow, for sure.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENTS TO THE WAR HAZARDS COMPENSATION ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of December 2, 1942, and the act of August 16, 1941, relating to injury, disability, and death resulting from war-risk hazards and from employment, suffered by employees of contractors of the United States, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 650 OF TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE, ENTITLED "COAST GUARD"

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 650 of title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," relating to the Coast Guard Supply Fund (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

FEES OF WITNESSES IN UNITED STATES COURTS AND BEFORE UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the fees of witnesses in the United States courts and before United States commissioners, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO APPOINTMENT OF SECRETARIES AND LAW CLERKS BY DISTRICT JUDGES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 752 of title 28, United States Code (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, Buffalo, N. Y., favoring an amendment to the Social Security Act relating to a reduction of the age of those who are to receive benefits under that act; to the Committee on Finance.

COMMEMORATIVE STAMP IN HONOR OF DR. SAMUEL J. CRUMBINE—RESOLUTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, one of the outstanding pioneer leaders in public health education was the late Dr. Samuel J. Crumline, of Kansas.

He was the first full-time health officer in our State and was recognized nationally and internationally for his outstanding work in this field.

I have submitted a resolution directing the Postmaster General to issue a special postal stamp to commemorate Dr. Crumline in recognition of his invaluable service in this field.

I have received a resolution adopted by the Ohio Public Health Association urging that we get early action on this commemorative stamp and I ask that it be referred to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Dr. Samuel J. Crumline, now deceased, was the first full-time health officer in Kansas and a pioneer and outstanding leader in public health education; and

Whereas United States Senator FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas, introduced a bill designated as S. 2936, in which authority was requested to direct the Postmaster General to issue a special postal stamp to commemorate Dr. Samuel J. Crumline in recognition of his invaluable service in directing and developing public health programs; and

Whereas S. 2936 has passed and is now in the hands of the Postmaster General: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Middle States Public Health Association and the Ohio Public Health Association transmit to the Postmaster General their endorsement to this bill and request that the postal stamp commemorating Dr. Samuel J. Crumline be issued as soon as arrangements can be made; and be it further

Resolved, That the original copy of this resolution be directed to the Postmaster General of the United States, a copy to Senator FRANK CARLSON, of the United States Senate, and a copy to Marion Folsom, Secretary of the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS, C. S. PALMER, M. D.,

*Chairman, Member, Ohio Public Health Association,
JANET JENNINGS,*

Member, Middle States Public Health Association,

EARL O. WRIGHT,

Member, Ohio Public Health Association and Middle States Public Health Association.

RESOLUTION OF KANSAS CHAPTER 13, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTMASTERS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, recently I have received much mail from citizens who live in Kansas, and, because of a ruling of the Post Office Department, carry their mailing address as Kansas City, Mo. There are several communities in Wyandotte and Johnson Counties where this situation prevails.

I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a resolution which has just been

adopted by the executive committee of Kansas Chapter, No. 13, of the National Association of Postmasters at the annual meeting of the committee on May 8, 1956, at Topeka, Kans.

I ask that the resolution be referred to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF KANSAS CHAPTER, NO. 13, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTMASTERS, AT ANNUAL MEETING OF SAID COMMITTEE MAY 8, 1956, AT TOPEKA, KANS.

Whereas an inquiry has been received from Senator FRANK CARLSON regarding the position of the Kansas Chapter of the National Association of Postmasters with respect to Kansas residents receiving their mail from an out-of-State post office and being thereby required to have an out-of-State post office address although such persons are legal residents of Kansas and reside within the boundaries of this State; and

Whereas we have received numerous complaints from such patrons and are convinced that they can receive postal delivery service equally as well or better from Kansas post offices; and

Whereas we believe that such practices of transferring the post office addresses of Kansans to out-of-State is misleading, is contrary to the wishes of the majority of such patrons and generally is unsound, unfair, and confusing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we reaffirm our position as being strenuously opposed to the assigning of Kansas patrons to post office addresses out of State and particularly in Kansas City, Mo., and we respectfully urge that such transfers cease and that correction be made to restore post office addresses of this State to such residents.

(The foregoing resolution adopted unanimously and the secretary instructed to transmit a copy thereof to Senator CARLSON.)

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—PETITIONS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received several petitions signed by sundry citizens of the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce. I ask unanimous consent that one of the petitions may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, one of the petitions was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWARK VALLEY, N. Y., May 22, 1956.

We the undersigned respectfully petition you to exercise the proper discretion vested in you by passing legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the States, under the 21st amendment, to control the sale of such beverages.

At a time when 1 out of 10 drinkers is becoming an alcoholic there should be no encouragement to increasing the use of such beverages.

Children and youth are continually being misled to consider them harmless, especially by the powerful audio and visual suggestions of radio and television.

THE CEMENT SHORTAGE—LETTER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Salzer Lumber Co., of Minneapolis, Minn., signed by John I. Salzer, relating to the cement shortage.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SALZER LUMBER CO.,
Minneapolis, Minn., May 29, 1956.
The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: You are undoubtedly aware of the very serious cement shortage which is developing in parts of Minnesota and the greater part of North Dakota.

We are in the building material business in the State of North Dakota with our headquarters in Minneapolis, and of course are extremely concerned over this situation. We depend entirely upon the suppliers in the Duluth area for our cement requirements and both the Cutler Magner and Universal Atlas people advise us at this time that they are at least 90 days behind in making shipment to their dealer customers. They explain the situation as being completely beyond their control.

The building of air bases at Minot, Grand Forks and Fargo, together with the completion of Garrison Dam, is taking such a tremendous drain from these two suppliers on dealer contractor orders that they are unable to supply their normal trade.

We know that these air bases and Garrison Dam are all very essential and of a priority nature. However, we do not feel that it is wise to jeopardize the economy of one particular section by completely depleting or depriving one particular section of such an essential building material as cement. We feel that the cement to be furnished to these projects could be supplied by not only Duluth but Mason City, Des Moines, Rapid City, or Montana. This would certainly more equitably distribute the burden of these projects named above, which are of a nationwide nature and concern rather than of local or area interest.

The differential in freight rates from the outlying areas mentioned above, and those of Duluth, would not amount to a great deal in dollars and cents when compared to the overall cost of these projects and when compared to the hardships which the cement shortage will create in Minnesota and North Dakota. Building activities already are way off in Minnesota and North Dakota areas and will be even further off unless something is done immediately to alleviate the cement shortage.

Yours very truly,

JOHN I. SALZER.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

S. 40. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William A. Curran (Rept. No. 2096); and

H. R. 692. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "Pray for peace" (Rept. No. 2095).

CITATION OF JOSEPH BRUNO FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. DANIEL), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution

(S. Res. 274) to cite Joseph Bruno for contempt of the United States Senate, and submitted a report (No. 2097) thereon; which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Joseph Bruno to answer questions before the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code of the Committee on the Judiciary, said refusal to answer being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the northern district of Illinois, to the end that the said Joseph Bruno may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF WILLIAM FRAZIER EVANS FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. DANIEL), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 275) to cite William Frazier Evans for contempt of the United States Senate, and submitted a report (No. 2098) thereon; which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of William Frazier Evans, alias Butch, to answer questions before the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code of the Committee on the Judiciary, said refusal to answer being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the eastern district of Michigan, to the end that the said William Frazier Evans, alias Butch, may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF ROBERT T. HOSOI FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. DANIEL), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 276) to cite Robert T. Hosoi for contempt of the United States Senate, and submitted a report (No. 2099) thereon; which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Robert T. Hosoi to appear before the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code of the Committee on the Judiciary, said refusal to appear being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the southern district of California, to the end that the said Robert T. Hosoi may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF SALVATORE SANTORO FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. DANIEL), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 277) to cite Salvatore Santoro

for contempt of the United States Senate, and submitted a report (No. 2100) thereon; which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Salvatore Santoro to answer questions before the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code of the Committee on the Judiciary, said refusal to answer being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the southern district of New York, to the end that the said Salvatore Santoro may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF JESSE ALEXANDER FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. DANIEL), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 278) to cite Jesse Alexander for contempt of the United States Senate, and submitted a report (No. 2101) thereon; which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Jesse Alexander to answer questions before the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code of the Committee on the Judiciary, said refusal to answer being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the northern district of Illinois, to the end that the said Jesse Alexander may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF JOSEPH BENDINELLI FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. DANIEL), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 279) to cite Joseph Bendinelli for contempt of the United States Senate, and submitted a report (No. 2102) thereon; which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Joseph Bendinelli to answer questions before the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code of the Committee on the Judiciary, said refusal to answer being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the southern district of New York, to the end that the said Joseph Bendinelli may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 3972. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear,

determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Mrs. Walter E. von Kalinowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 3973. A bill for the relief of Eero Juno Valkonen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 3974. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to grant nonprofit educational institutions exemptions from the excise taxes which are now applicable to public educational institutions; and

S. 3975. A bill to amend paragraphs 1773 and 1774 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit free importation of certain religious articles by additional organizations; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3976. A bill for the relief of Carmella Spinelli Porcelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3977. A bill to extend for an additional 6 years the authority to make, guarantee, and insure loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3978. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, render judgment upon the claim of Col. Walter E. Cole for retirement from the Army of the United States due to a service-connected disability; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 3979. A bill to provide for transportation of certain members of the National Flying Farmers' Association, and their aircraft, from the United States to Europe and return; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 3980. A bill to establish public use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. KERR):

S. 3981. A bill to provide a more equitable method for computing the self-employment income of farmers under the Social Security Act for taxable years ending during the period commencing January 1, 1955 and ending December 31, 1958; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 3982. A bill to provide for the maintenance of production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. McNAMARA, and Mr. BENDER):

S. 3983. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection of poultry and poultry products so as to prohibit the movement in interstate or foreign commerce of unsound, unhealthful, diseased, unwholesome, or adulterated poultry or poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3984. A bill to authorize the Chief of Engineers to reimburse owners and tenants of land acquired for Tuttle Creek Reservoir,

Missouri River Basin, for certain business losses; to the Committee on Public Works. (See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3985. A bill to validate certain payments made to members and former members of the naval service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 3986. A bill for the relief of Frosso Spiliotou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 3987. A bill to provide for the establishment of additional animal disease laboratory facilities at or near the Utah State Agriculture College; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3988. A bill for the relief of Ursula H. Mueller; and

S. 3989. A bill for the relief of Johann Leber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 3990. A bill to encourage the barter of surplus agricultural commodities for supplies, materials, and equipment financed under the Mutual Security Act of 1954; and

S. 3991. A bill to facilitate the control and eradication of certain animal diseases, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate the agricultural attaché program, to facilitate the operations of the Farmers' Home Administration, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation and the Forest Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

S. 3992. A bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the cutting of timber, the manufacture and sale of lumber, and the preservation of the forests on the Menominee Indian Reservation in the State of Wisconsin," approved March 28, 1908, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. SCHOEPPPEL, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. MALONE, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WELKER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. BEALL):

S. 3993. A bill to exempt certain shipments of farm produce from the tax on the transportation of property; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. J. Res. 176. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of additional animal disease laboratory facilities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. POTTER:

S. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built tankers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. POTTER when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

FREE ELECTIONS IN THE SLOVAK NATION

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 81), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas national self-determination is a universal aspiration inherent in all peoples and nations; and

Whereas the Slovak people and nation were among the first to suffer Communist aggression; and

Whereas the Slovak people and nation have been denied the right of self-determination: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the Slovak people and nation are entitled to and should no longer be denied the right of self-determination; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee proposed to the American delegation in the United Nations that the request for free elections or a plebiscite under United Nations supervision, by the Slovak people in order to choose their own form of government and to reestablish their own Slovak nation, be placed on the agenda of the United Nations Assembly for consideration and such action as may be appropriate.

RESOLUTIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. DANIEL), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported the following original resolutions, which were placed on the calendar:

S. Res. 274. Resolution to cite Joseph Bruno for contempt of the United States Senate;

S. Res. 275. Resolution to cite William Frazier Evans for contempt of the United States Senate;

S. Res. 276. Resolution to cite Robert T. Hosoi for contempt of the United States Senate;

S. Res. 277. Resolution to cite Salvatore Santoro for contempt of the United States Senate;

S. Res. 278. Resolution to cite Jesse Alexander for contempt of the United States Senate; and

S. Res. 279. Resolution to cite Joseph Bendinello for contempt of the United States Senate.

(See resolutions printed in full, which appear under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

PUBLIC USE OF NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish public use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, and for other purposes.

This bill provides for the setting aside of 10 percent of the national forest receipts each year for development, maintenance, and operation of facilities and areas for recreation use, improvement and maintenance of wildlife habitat, and to provide for adequate safety, sanitation and health in connection with uses of the national forests. The amount so set aside shall not exceed \$7,500,000 in any one year.

I would like to make it clear that this bill does not give the Agriculture Department further authority to charge fees for the recreational use of national forests. In fact, it limits the Agriculture Department's existing authority.

This bill, introduced by myself and Senator MANSFIELD, is similar to H. R. 1823, introduced by Representative METCALF. At this point I ask unanimous

consent to have printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, an editorial supporting the Metcalf bill entitled "Why Not Let Our National Forests Use Some of the Profits?" which appeared recently in the Saturday Evening Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY NOT LET OUR NATIONAL FORESTS USE SOME OF THE PROFIT?

With the increasing rush for outdoor recreation the number of visitors to the national forests has doubled in the past 7 years. They reached a total of 45 million last year.

But many of the visitors had reason to complain. That is because the recreational facilities of the national forests have not kept up with this fastest growing of their multiple uses. A lot of the facilities date back to CCC days in the 1930's. Virtually all of the 4,700 improved camping ground and picnic areas are crowded far beyond their capacity. Other visitors are compelled to camp out in undeveloped areas, without fire protection, sanitation, or other accommodations. Some of the recreation areas have been closed because there was not money enough to keep them in proper condition.

The situation has so deteriorated that the Forest Service estimates that at least double the present appropriation is needed for cleanup and maintenance alone. Funds are even less adequate for the needs of the many annual visitors to the unimproved wilderness areas as campers, hikers, hunters, fishermen, or trail-riders. The national forests, with their 81,000 miles of streams and 2,750,000 acres of lakes, comprise the choicest public hunting and fishing areas in the Nation. But funds to maintain favorable game and fish habitat conditions have lagged behind with the others.

The national forests are a profitable investment. The receipts they turned in last year, principally from timber sales and grazing fees, exceeded operating and other costs by \$18 million. It seems logical that some of this profit should be reinvested for the benefit of the public.

This is the practical proposal in a bill introduced in Congress by Representative LEE METCALF, of Montana. It would establish public recreation use of the national forests as a policy of Congress. No such policy now exists. The bill provides that 10 percent of the national forest receipts be set aside each year for the development, maintenance, and operation of facilities and areas for recreation use. The amount to be set aside is limited to \$5,500,000 in any one year, and none of it can be used for further land acquisition.

There is nothing revolutionary in this policy. As far back as 1908 Congress adopted a similar policy, allotting 25 percent of all money received from the forests to the States for roads and schools in the counties that contain national-forest lands. The Metcalf proposal would not disturb such funds.

The national forests are a good place to begin catching up with the need for greater recreational facilities for the people, and the Metcalf bill provides a logical method by which it can be done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3980) to establish public use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

COMPUTATION OF CERTAIN SELF-EMPLOYMENT INCOME OF FARMERS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Montana may proceed.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to give our older farmers relief from a very unjust situation. In 1954 Congress passed an act bringing self-employed farmers under the old-age and survivors insurance program. In accordance with provisions of the basic act, farmers already 65 years old, or upon attainment of age 65, become eligible to retire on social-security benefits after having paid social-security tax on at least 6 quarters of earnings. Since farmers were started on the program in 1955, and pay their social-security tax with their annual income-tax reports, the bulk of elder farmers will first become eligible to apply for retirement in January 1957, when their 1955 and 1956 incomes have been established and taxes paid on them.

Census data indicates that there are approximately 900,000 farmers who are already 65, or will attain that age by January 1957. It is estimated that at least half of this total number normally have the necessary \$400 per year minimum net earnings to make them eligible for old-age and survivors insurance.

In including these farmer citizens under the act in 1954, it was Congress' intention that they should have social-security benefits through their later years based upon their average level of earnings and economic station in life during their productive years.

Unfortunately, the base period on which benefits will be determined for the nearly half million farmers who will become eligible for benefits next year will not reflect normal earnings, or anything close to normal earnings, for the most of them. Those who retire next year will receive benefits based on their net farm earnings in 1955 and 1956; two of the worst farm income years in this generation. As we all know, net farm income in these 2 years is averaging around \$11 billion, compared to a peak of \$17 billion in 1949.

Because of this serious farm-income situation, the yardstick on which benefits for the elder farmers who desire to retire next year has been shortened, on the average, from 36 to about 23 inches.

As we know, extensive floods and droughts as well as low prices seriously impaired the incomes of tens of thousands of farmers last year, and they will depress large numbers this year.

I have had considerable correspondence with and about farmers who have had better than \$4,200 net earnings for many years—the maximum on which

social security can be based—but fell far below in 1955 due to drought, flood, the low price of hogs or low price of some other commodity. Others, below the \$4,200 figure, have had their earnings drastically reduced, some of them unfortunately even below the minimum to become eligible for old-age and survivors insurance.

The \$4,200-year-year farmer whose earnings dropped to \$1,600 faces a loss of benefits of from \$162.80 per month for himself and wife to \$102.80. The \$1,800-per-year farmer whose income dropped to \$540 will receive only \$45 per month for himself and wife instead of \$102.80.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a table of old-age and survivors insurance benefits for farmers, farmer and wife, and survivors at various income levels. This table indicates how the unusual drops in net earnings of farmers in 1955 and 1956 can reduce their social-security benefits for the rest of their lives.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Examples of OASI monthly benefits

Average monthly earnings after 1950	Monthly retirement payments		Monthly survivors payments		
	Farmer	Farmer and wife	Widow, child, or parent	Widow and 1 child	Widow and 2 children
\$45.....	\$30.00	\$45.00	\$30.00	\$45.00	\$50.20
\$50.....	35.00	52.50	35.00	52.50	58.60
\$55.....	40.00	60.00	40.00	60.00	66.00
\$60.....	45.00	67.50	45.00	67.50	73.40
\$65.....	50.00	75.00	50.00	75.00	80.80
\$70.....	55.00	82.50	55.00	82.50	88.20
\$75.....	60.00	90.00	60.00	90.00	95.60
\$80.....	65.00	97.50	65.00	97.50	103.00
\$85.....	70.00	105.00	70.00	105.00	110.40
\$90.....	75.00	112.50	75.00	112.50	117.80
\$95.....	80.00	120.00	80.00	120.00	125.20
\$100.....	85.00	127.50	85.00	127.50	132.60
\$105.....	90.00	135.00	90.00	135.00	140.00
\$110.....	95.00	142.50	95.00	142.50	147.40
\$115.....	100.00	150.00	100.00	150.00	154.80
\$120.....	105.00	157.50	105.00	157.50	162.20
\$125.....	110.00	165.00	110.00	165.00	169.60
\$130.....	115.00	172.50	115.00	172.50	177.00
\$135.....	120.00	180.00	120.00	180.00	184.40
\$140.....	125.00	187.50	125.00	187.50	191.80
\$145.....	130.00	195.00	130.00	195.00	199.20
\$150.....	135.00	202.50	135.00	202.50	206.60
\$155.....	140.00	210.00	140.00	210.00	214.00
\$160.....	145.00	217.50	145.00	217.50	221.40
\$165.....	150.00	225.00	150.00	225.00	228.80
\$170.....	155.00	232.50	155.00	232.50	236.20
\$175.....	160.00	240.00	160.00	240.00	243.60
\$180.....	165.00	247.50	165.00	247.50	251.00
\$185.....	170.00	255.00	170.00	255.00	258.40
\$190.....	175.00	262.50	175.00	262.50	265.80
\$195.....	180.00	270.00	180.00	270.00	273.20
\$200.....	185.00	277.50	185.00	277.50	280.60
\$205.....	190.00	285.00	190.00	285.00	288.00
\$210.....	195.00	292.50	195.00	292.50	295.40
\$215.....	200.00	300.00	200.00	300.00	302.80
\$220.....	205.00	307.50	205.00	307.50	310.20
\$225.....	210.00	315.00	210.00	315.00	317.60
\$230.....	215.00	322.50	215.00	322.50	325.00
\$235.....	220.00	330.00	220.00	330.00	332.40
\$240.....	225.00	337.50	225.00	337.50	339.80
\$245.....	230.00	345.00	230.00	345.00	347.20
\$250.....	235.00	352.50	235.00	352.50	354.60
\$255.....	240.00	360.00	240.00	360.00	362.00
\$260.....	245.00	367.50	245.00	367.50	369.40
\$265.....	250.00	375.00	250.00	375.00	376.80
\$270.....	255.00	382.50	255.00	382.50	384.20
\$275.....	260.00	390.00	260.00	390.00	391.60
\$280.....	265.00	397.50	265.00	397.50	399.00
\$285.....	270.00	405.00	270.00	405.00	406.40
\$290.....	275.00	412.50	275.00	412.50	413.80
\$295.....	280.00	420.00	280.00	420.00	421.20
\$300.....	285.00	427.50	285.00	427.50	428.60
\$305.....	290.00	435.00	290.00	435.00	436.00
\$310.....	295.00	442.50	295.00	442.50	443.40
\$315.....	300.00	450.00	300.00	450.00	450.80
\$320.....	305.00	457.50	305.00	457.50	458.20
\$325.....	310.00	465.00	310.00	465.00	465.60
\$330.....	315.00	472.50	315.00	472.50	473.00
\$335.....	320.00	480.00	320.00	480.00	480.40
\$340.....	325.00	487.50	325.00	487.50	487.80
\$345.....	330.00	495.00	330.00	495.00	495.20
\$350.....	335.00	502.50	335.00	502.50	502.60

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in perfecting the social security program we have recognized that economic misfortunes, illness and other causes sometimes unduly depress the income of our citizens for a year, or several years. We have provided that 4 or 5 years may be dropped out of calculations determining the base of the fresh start allowed in establishing base periods beginning with 1950, applicants are able to obtain benefits on their 2 best years.

Because agricultural income is subject to tremendous fluctuations due to both natural and economic forces, farmers are especially entitled to a drop-out provision—to a provision which will ameliorate the effect of disaster years on their old-age benefits.

But the older farmers, who have only 1955 and 1956 on which to base their claims, are unable to take advantage of any drop-out years. Under the law as it is now written, they must accept the disastrous incomes of 1955 and 1956 as their base even though they may be the worst income years in their whole farming experience.

The bill I have introduced is intended to achieve the original purpose and intention of the Congress to give farmers benefits based on normal earnings by making it possible for farmers, during the beginning years of their OASI coverage, to substitute one or more of the years between 1950 and 1955, for subnormal incomes which might occur in 1955 to 1958. Under the proposed amendment, a farmer may report—or file an amended report as to 1955 income—that his net earnings for any of the years 1955 to 1958 were:

First. Actual net earnings; or

Second. The presumed net earnings under the provision of the Social Security Act now in force—presumed net earnings of \$900 are allowed if the farmer's gross sales were \$1,800; or

Third. Actual net earnings for any one of the years 1951 through 1954, if the earnings can be substantiated by income tax returns regularly filed with the Internal Revenue Bureau; or

Fourth. Assumed net earnings for one of the years 1951 through 1954 computed by multiplying the farmers' production units, or facilities, by the average net earnings from such units in the same general farming area for any of the years 1951 to 1954.

In preparing this amendment, I have consulted with experts in the old-age and survivors insurance agency.

They are reluctant to use statements or affidavits of income from claimants as the basis of benefit payments. Consequently, the third and fourth alternatives I have just stated were included as the basis for establishing income in the 1951-54 period—substantiation by income-tax returns, or assumption that the farmer's net earnings were average in his area for his size and type of operation.

Experts at the Agricultural Marketing Service advise me that farmers' average earnings per acre, or per head of livestock, can be established as required from available statistics.

Mr. President, I hope there can be speedy consideration and enactment of this measure.

The Congress certainly does not want the agricultural hard times of 1955 and 1956 to condemn a half million elder farm families to lowered living standards for the remainder of their lives, yet that is what will have been done if they are forced to accept old-age and survivors insurance benefits based on the disastrous farm income levels of these years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3981) to provide a more equitable method for computing the self-employment income of farmers under the Social Security Act for taxable years ending during the period commencing January 1, 1955, and ending December 31, 1958, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. KERR), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

DOMESTIC TUNGSTEN, ASBESTOS, FLUORSPAR, AND COLUMBIUM-TANTALUM PRODUCTION AND PURCHASE ACT OF 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], my colleague, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would extend the Government purchase programs covering tungsten, asbestos, acid-grade fluorspar, and columbite-tantalite.

This legislation has been carefully drawn after extensive hearings before the Minerals, Materials and Fuels Subcommittee, and executive department witnesses have testified it will meet no objection or opposition on the part of the administration.

I would like to also point out that the committee has been advised by the Office of Defense Mobilization that it is now in the process of extending, by Executive directive, the purchase program covering six other strategic minerals which can be absorbed immediately into the national stockpile. Legislation, the committee has been advised, is needed only in the case of tungsten, asbestos, acid-grade fluorspar, and columbite-tantalite.

I and my associates on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs would welcome other Senators who may wish to join us in sponsorship of this vital legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3982) to provide for the maintenance of production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbite-tantalum in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REIMBURSEMENT OF OWNERS AND TENANTS OF LAND ACQUIRED FOR TUTTLE CREEK RESERVOIR, FOR CERTAIN BUSINESS LOSSES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the chief of engineers to reimburse owners and tenants of land acquired for the Tuttle Creek Reservoir

in the Missouri Basin for certain business losses.

This is a companion bill to H. R. 11400 introduced by Representative AVERY on May 23.

These property owners and tenants are being forced to sell their property or business and everyone agrees that they will suffer a business loss, even though the Federal Government can and will pay them for the actual value of the real property or merchandise.

It is unfortunate that under present statutes, we cannot pay for goodwill that has been established over years of service to this community and area.

These people who are forced to liquidate their real property and business, are entitled to this consideration and I think everyone agrees they should be compensated not only for their actual property values, but for intangible values that can be accumulated only after years of service in a community.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3984) to authorize the chief of engineers to reimburse owners and tenants of land acquired for Tuttle Creek Reservoir, Missouri River Basin, for certain business losses, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

ADDITIONAL ANIMAL DISEASE LABORATORY FACILITIES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to provide for the establishment of additional animal disease laboratory facilities. The Appropriations Committee deleted an item of \$10 million for an animal disease laboratory from the agricultural appropriation bill for 1957. There was no opposition to the establishment of such a laboratory, but the committee was of the opinion that it should not be located at the agricultural center in Beltsville, Md.

The joint resolution which I am introducing today would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to locate such a laboratory, and would provide that, in so doing, he should confer with a representative group or committee from the livestock industry, the land-grant colleges, and other agencies and organizations, in order that the laboratory might be properly located elsewhere than at Beltsville.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 176) to provide for the establishment of additional animal disease laboratory facilities, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SALE OF CERTAIN WAR-BUILT TANKERS

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built tank-

ers. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be held in the Secretary's office until the close of business on Friday, June 8, 1956, for the purpose of adding additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be held in the Secretary's office, as requested by the Senator from Michigan.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 177) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built tankers, introduced by Mr. POTTER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, explaining the purpose of the joint resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR POTTER

The purpose of this joint resolution is to permit the institution of common-carrier steamship service with United States-flag vessels between Atlantic coast ports of the United States and Cuba and Mexico on essential trade routes 3 and 4. These are the only steamship services which have been declared to be essential to the foreign commerce of the United States by the Maritime Administrator and Secretary of Commerce under section 211 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, on which there is no United States-flag operation.

Until 1953 United States-flag service was provided on these routes by the New York and Cuba Mail Line, which was one of the oldest steamship services under the American flag. The United States Government had invested many millions of dollars in the routes in the form of operating subsidy and construction subsidy to New York and Cuba Mail Line. That operator was subsidized from the outset of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and before that time it received financial aid from the Government under ocean mail contracts under previous maritime legislation.

In 1948 new financial interests succeeded to the control of New York and Cuba mail and in 1953 the company cancelled its operating differential subsidy contract with the Federal Maritime Board, and it subsequently sold its vessels. That operator now offers only a foreign-flag service with chartered vessels. Despite the efforts of the Federal Maritime Board in 1953, and thereafter, to interest existing subsidized lines to take over the former New York and Cuba mail service under the American flag, there has been little or no interest shown by such operators in taking over the service and protecting the substantial investment of the Government on the routes.

The reluctance of American-flag operators to institute service in the Cuba or Mexican trades can be attributed to the substantial cargo loading and discharging problems which are attendant to these services. These loading and discharging problems include not only the high costs of handling general cargo, but also the inordinate delays which are occasioned by the time spent in port by the standard type berth operation.

Browning Steamship Lines propose to institute United States-flag service on these essential routes. As the solution to the substantial loading and discharging problems, Browning Steamship Lines intend to operate a complete container-ship operation, such containers being capable of handling all general cargo moving on the routes, including refrigerated cargo. The containers are made

of steel and would have a cubic capacity of approximately 900 cubic feet.

This container operation offers the tremendous advantage of consolidating cargo in one convenient handling unit and would eliminate export packaging requirements for outbound movements. The company estimates that this operation will eliminate more than 75 percent, of all handling, which will result in a commensurate reduction in handling costs and port delays.

The company has canvassed the private market for ships capable of being used for this service. There are none available with the necessary cubic capacity and speed. Although the company is willing to construct new vessels for the service, the necessary time interval would not permit the institution of American-flag service for a period of 2 or 3 years.

After conducting a detailed and lengthy study, Browning Steamship Lines has concluded that the most appropriate vessels for instituting immediate service are T2-SE-A2 tankers, which would be converted so as to provide three 'tween decks for the carriage of containers. The company proposes to purchase two tankers from the Government and reconver them as container ships at a cost of approximately \$3 million per vessel. Browning has had these plans worked out by its naval architects.

The company has arranged for a substantial investment of private capital into these routes. The cost of the containers alone would amount to approximately \$8 million.

In addition to the investment in the purchase and reconversion of the vessels and in the containers, Browning intends to construct two specially designed container ships in domestic shipyards, as soon as operating experience makes such a step feasible. The reconvered T2-SE-A2 tankers themselves should have an economic life as dry cargo vessels of at least 15 years and would be a substantial addition to the American merchant marine and an aid to the national defense.

The sale of the two T2-SE-A2 tankers contemplated by this bill will allow for the immediate institution of long-range and permanent United States-flag services on routes where at the present time there is a serious void in the operation of our merchant marine.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO PAYMENT OF ANNUITIES TO DEPENDENTS OF JUDGES—AMENDMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3410) to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of judges, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CONTROL, APPROPRIATION, USE, AND DISTRIBUTION OF WATER—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] be added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 863) to govern the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of water, the next time the bill is printed. The bill was introduced by me, on behalf of myself and other Senators, on February 1, 1955.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, and so forth, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MUNDT:

Address delivered by him to the State convention of the South Carolina State Bankers' Association, in Greenville, S. C., May 5, 1956.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by him on June 3, 1956, at the annual meeting of the Urban League of Greater New York.

By Mr. DUFF:

Excerpts from address delivered by him at the fourth national convention of the Polish-American Congress, in Philadelphia, Pa., on May 30, 1956.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Excerpt from introductory remarks by Assistant Secretary of the Army George H. Roderick, and address delivered by Senator WILEY at dedication of the Eisenhower Lock on the St. Lawrence Seaway, at Massena, N. Y., on June 3, 1956.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Address delivered by Senator ROBERTSON at commencement exercises, Staunton Military Academy, on June 3, 1956.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

A report to the people of Wisconsin by Senator MCCARTHY concerning East-West trade.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a Senator, and as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Chair desires to announce that the Senate received today a list of 120 nominations in the diplomatic service of the United States. The list is printed elsewhere in the Senate proceedings of today. Notice is given that these nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

ADDRESS BY FIRST PARTY SECRETARY N. S. KHRUSHCHEV AT 20TH PARTY CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, because of its importance, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a State Department release dated today, together with the purported version of the speech of First Party Secretary N. S. Khrushchev, at a session of the 20th party congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, on February 25 of this year. This was the speech of the so-called down-grading of Stalin and the party hierarchy.

Mr. President, I think one significant thing about the speech, which will be of interest to the Members of Congress and also to the American people—to whom the full text might not otherwise be available, except as they can obtain copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the various public libraries—is that while there is considerable criticism of the methods of Stalin in liquidating certain of the Communists, I find in the speech no expressions of regret on the part of

Mr. Khrushchev for the liquidation during the same period of time of the vast number of liberals, democrats, and non-Marxist Socialists, and other believers in human freedom, nor do I find in the speech the slightest indication of repentance on the part of Khrushchev for the destruction of the freedom of the people of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, who lost their freedom and their sovereignty as nations despite the solemn pledges to the contrary by the Soviet Union.

In the speech, I find not the slightest indication of a single deed, such as suggested some time ago by President Eisenhower, which might constitute a demonstration that a basic change had occurred in the Soviet long-term strategic concept. Neither do I find in the speech any indication in favor of a free and united Germany; nor any indication that the heavy hand of control will be lifted from satellite governments of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, and Albania; nor any indication that the hundreds of thousands of persons in the slave-labor camps in Siberia will be given their freedom; nor any indication of any kind of compensation—not restitution, because the dead cannot be returned to life—for the loss of the lives of those who have been liquidated under the Soviet regime; nor the slightest indication that the Soviets are prepared to accept the kind of aerial inspection of arms as proposed by President Eisenhower, or other adequate arms inspection, which would avoid the type of farce which has existed in Korea, where the inspection teams have not been able to do their work, under the terms of the Korean armistice.

No, Mr. President; the speech does not contain the slightest indication that any deed of that sort has been performed, aside from the downgrading of the former leader, Stalin; there is no indication of an offer by those who were his accomplices in crime to return any of the loot.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, following the printing of the speech in the body of the RECORD, there be printed a brief article by Roscoe Drummond on the Khrushchev speech.

There being no objection, the speech and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(NOTE.—The Department of State has recently obtained from a confidential source a copy of a document which purports to be a version of the speech of First Party Secretary N. S. Khrushchev at a session of the 20th Party Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on February 25, 1956. This session was limited in attendance to the delegates from the U. S. S. R. The document is being released in response to many inquiries. This version is understood to have been prepared for the guidance of the party leadership of a Communist party outside of the U. S. S. R. The Department of State does not vouch for the authenticity of the document, and in releasing it, intends that the document speak for itself.)

Comrades, in the report of the Central Committee of the party at the 20th Congress, in a number of speeches by delegates to the Congress, as also formerly during the plenary CC/CPSU sessions, quite a lot has been said about the cult of the individual and about its harmful consequences.

After Stalin's death the Central Committee of the party began to implement a policy of explaining concisely and consistently that it is impermissible and foreign to the spirit of Marxism-Leninism to elevate one person, to transform him into superman possessing supernatural characteristics akin to those of a god. Such a man supposedly knows everything, sees everything, thinks for everyone, can do anything, is infallible in his behavior.

Such a belief about a man, and specifically about Stalin, was cultivated among us for many years.

The objective of the present report is not a thorough evaluation of Stalin's life and activity. Concerning Stalin's merits, an entirely sufficient number of books, pamphlets and studies had already been written in his lifetime. The role of Stalin in the preparation and execution of the Socialist revolution, in the civil-war, and in the fight for the construction of socialism in our country is universally known. Everyone knows this well. At the present we are concerned with a question which has immense importance for the Party now and for the future—(we are concerned) with how the cult of the person of Stalin has been gradually growing, the cult which became at a certain specific stage the source of a whole series of exceedingly serious and grave perversions of party principles, of party democracy, of revolutionary legality.

Because of the fact that not all as yet realize fully the practical consequences resulting from the cult of the individual, the great harm caused by the violation of the principle of collective direction of the party and because of the accumulation of immense and limitless power in the hands of one person—the Central Committee of the party considers it absolutely necessary to make the material pertaining to this matter available to the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Allow me first of all to remind you how severely the classics of Marxism-Leninism denounced every manifestation of the cult of the individual. In a letter to the German political worker, Wilhelm Bloss, Marx stated: "From my antipathy to any cult of the individual, I never made public during the existence of the International the numerous addresses from various countries which recognized my merits and which annoyed me. I did not even reply to them, except sometimes to rebuke their authors. Engels and I first joined the secret society of Communists on the condition that everything making for superstitious worship of authority would be deleted from its statute. Lassalle subsequently did quite the opposite."

Sometime later Engels wrote: "Both Marx and I have always been against any public manifestation with regard to individuals, with the exception of cases when it had an important purpose; and we most strongly opposed such manifestations which during our lifetime concerned us personally."

The great modesty of the genius of the revolution, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, is known. Lenin had always stressed the role of the people as the creator of history, the directing and organizational role of the party as a living and creative organism, and also the role of the central committee.

Marxism does not negate the role of the leaders of the workers' class in directing the revolutionary liberation movement.

While ascribing great importance to the role of the leaders and organizers of the masses, Lenin at the same time mercilessly stigmatized every manifestation of the cult of the individual, inexorably combated the foreign-to-Marxism views about a "hero" and a "crowd" and countered all efforts to oppose a "hero" to the masses and to the people.

Lenin taught that the party's strength depends on its indissoluble unity with the masses, on the fact that behind the party follow the people—workers, peasants and

intelligentsia. "Only he will win and retain the power," said Lenin, "who believes in the people, who submerges himself in the fountain of the living creativeness of the people."

Lenin spoke with pride about the Bolshevik Communist Party as the leader and teacher of the people; he called for the presentation of all the most important questions before the opinion of knowledgeable workers, before the opinion of their party; he said: "We believe in it, we see in it the wisdom, the honor, and the conscience of our epoch."

Lenin resolutely stood against every attempt aimed at belittling or weakening the directing role of the party in the structure of the Soviet state. He worked out Bolshevik principles of party direction and norms of party life, stressing that the guiding principle of party leadership is its collegiality. Already during the prerevolutionary years Lenin called the central committee of the party a collective of leaders and the guardian and interpreter of party principles. "During the period between congresses," pointed out Lenin, "the central committee guards and interprets the principles of the party."

Underlining the role of the central committee of the party and its authority, Vladimir Ilyich pointed out: "Our central committee constituted itself as a closely centralized and highly authoritative group."

During Lenin's life the central committee of the party was a real expression of collective leadership of the party and of the Nation. Being a militant Marxist-revolutionist, always unyielding in matters of principle, Lenin never imposed by force his views upon his coworkers. He tried to convince; he patiently explained his opinions to others. Lenin always diligently observed that the norms of party life were realized, that the party statute was enforced, that the party congresses and the plenary sessions of the central committee took place at the proper intervals.

In addition to the great accomplishments of V. I. Lenin for the victory of the working class and of the working peasants, for the victory of our party and for the application of the ideas of scientific communism to life, his acute mind expressed itself also in this that he detected in Stalin in time those negative characteristics which resulted later in grave consequences. Fearing the future fate of the party and of the Soviet nation, V. I. Lenin made a completely correct characterization of Stalin, pointing out that it was necessary to consider the question of transferring Stalin from the position of Secretary General because of the fact that Stalin is excessively rude, that he does not have a proper attitude toward his comrades, that he is capricious, and abuses his power.

In December 1922, in a letter to the party congress, Vladimir Ilyich wrote: "After taking over the position of Secretary General, Comrade Stalin accumulated in his hands immeasurable power and I am not certain whether he will be always able to use this power with the required care."

This letter—a political document of tremendous importance, known in the party history as Lenin's testament—was distributed among the delegates to the 20th Party Congress. You have read it, and will undoubtedly read it again more than once. You might reflect on Lenin's plain words, in which expression is given to Vladimir Ilyich's anxiety concerning the party, the people, the state, and the future direction of party policy.

Vladimir Ilyich said: "Stalin is excessively rude, and this defect, which can be freely tolerated in our midst and in contacts among us Communists, becomes a defect which cannot be tolerated in one holding the position of the Secretary General. Because of this, I propose that the comrades consider the method by which Stalin would be removed from this position and by which another man would be selected for it, a man,

who above all, would differ from Stalin in only one quality, namely, greater tolerance, greater loyalty, greater kindness, and more considerate attitude toward the comrades, a less capricious temper, etc."

This document of Lenin's was made known to the delegates at the 13th Party Congress, who discussed the question of transferring Stalin from the position of Secretary General. The delegates declared themselves in favor of retaining Stalin in this post, hoping that he would heed the critical remarks of Vladimir Ilyich and would be able to overcome the defects which caused Lenin serious anxiety.

Comrades, the party congress should become acquainted with two new documents, which confirm Stalin's character as already outlined by Vladimir Ilyich Lenin in his testament. These documents are a letter from Nadezhda Konstantinovna Krupskaya to Kameney, who was at that time head of the Political Bureau, and a personal letter from Vladimir Ilyich Lenin to Stalin.

1. I will now read these documents:

"LEV BORISOVICH:

"Because of a short letter which I had written in words dictated to me by Vladimir Ilyich by permission of the doctors, Stalin allowed himself yesterday an unusually rude outburst directed at me. This is not my first day in the party. During all these 30 years I have never heard from any comrade one word of rudeness. The business of the party and of Ilyich are not less dear to me than to Stalin. I need at present the maximum of self-control. What one can and what one cannot discuss with Ilyich—I know better than any doctor, because I know what makes him nervous and what does not, in any case I know better than Stalin. I am turning to you and to Grigory as to much closer comrades of V. I. and I beg you to protect me from rude interference with my private life and from vile invectives and threats. I have no doubt as to what will be the unanimous decision of the Control Commission, with which Stalin sees fit to threaten me; however, I have neither the strength nor the time to waste on this foolish quarrel. And I am a living person and my nerves are strained to the utmost.

N. KRUPSKAYA."

Nadezhda Konstantinovna wrote this letter on December 23, 1922. After 2½ months, in March 1923, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin sent Stalin the following letter:

2. The Letter of V. I. Lenin

To Comrade Stalin:

(Copies for: Kameney and Zinoviev.)

DEAR COMRADE STALIN: You permitted yourself a rude summons of my wife to the telephone and a rude reprimand of her. Despite the fact that she told you that she agreed to forget what was said, nevertheless Zinoviev and Kameney heard about it from her. I have no intention to forget so easily that which is being done against me, and I need not stress here that I consider as directed against me that which is being done against my wife. I ask you, therefore, that you weigh carefully whether you are agreeable to retracting your words and apologizing or whether you prefer the severance of relations between us. [Commotion in the hall.]

Sincerely,

LENIN.

MARCH, 5, 1923.

Comrades, I will not comment on these documents. They speak eloquently for themselves. Since Stalin could behave in this manner during Lenin's life, could thus behave toward Nadezhda Konstantinovna Krupskaya, whom the party knows well and values highly as a loyal friend of Lenin and as an active fighter for the cause of the party since its creation—we can easily imagine how Stalin treated other people. These negative characteristics of his developed steadily and during the last years acquired an absolutely insufferable character.

As later events have proven, Lenin's anxiety was justified; in the first period after Lenin's death Stalin still paid attention to his (i. e. Lenin's) advice, but, later he began to disregard the serious admonitions of Vladimir Ilyich.

When we analyze the practice of Stalin in regard to the direction of the party and of the country, when we pause to consider everything which Stalin perpetrated, we must be convinced that Lenin's fears were justified. The negative characteristics of Stalin, which, in Lenin's time, were only incipient, transformed themselves during the last years into a grave abuse of power by Stalin, which caused untold harm to our party.

We have to consider seriously and analyze correctly this matter in order that we may preclude any possibility of a repetition in any form whatever of what took place during the life of Stalin, who absolutely did not tolerate collegiality in leadership and in work, and who practiced brutal violence, not only toward everything which opposed him, but also toward that which seemed to his capricious and despotic character, contrary to his concepts.

Stalin acted not through persuasion, explanation, and patient cooperation with people, but by imposing his concepts and demanding absolute submission to his opinion. Whoever opposed this concept or tried to prove his viewpoint, and the correctness of his position—was doomed to removal from the leading collective and to subsequent moral and physical annihilation. This was especially true during the period following the 17th party congress, when many prominent party leaders and rank-and-file party workers, honest and dedicated to the cause of communism, fell victim to Stalin's despotism.

We must affirm that the party had fought a serious fight against the Trotskyites, rightists and bourgeois nationalists, and that it disarmed ideologically all the enemies of Leninism. This ideological fight was carried on successfully as a result of which the party became strengthened and tempered. Here Stalin played a positive role.

The party led a great political ideological struggle against those in its own ranks who proposed anti-Leninist theses, who represented a political line hostile to the party and to the cause of socialism. This was a stubborn and a difficult fight but a necessary one, because the political line of both the Trotskyite-Zinovievite bloc and of the Bukharinites led actually toward the restoration of capitalism and capitulation to the world bourgeoisie. Let us consider for a moment what would have happened if in 1923-29 the political line of right deviation had prevailed among us, or orientation toward "cotton-dress industrialization," or toward the kulak, etc. We would not now have a powerful heavy industry, we would not have the Kolkhozes, we would find ourselves disarmed and weak in a capitalist encirclement.

It was for this reason that the party led an inexorable ideological fight and explained to all party members and to the nonparty masses the harm and the danger of the anti-Leninist proposals of the Trotskyite opposition and the rightist opportunists. And this great work of explaining the party line bore fruit; both Trotskyites and the rightist opportunists were politically isolated; the overwhelming party majority supported the Leninist line and the party was able to awaken and organize the working masses to apply the Leninist party line and to build socialism.

Worth noting is the fact that even during the progress of the furious ideological fight against the Trotskyites, the Zinovievites, the Bukharinites and others, extreme repressive measures were not used against them. The fight was on ideological grounds. But some years later when socialism in our country

was fundamentally constructed, when the exploiting classes were generally liquidated, when the Soviet social structure had radically changed, when the social basis for political movements and groups hostile to the party had violently contracted, when the ideological opponents of the party were long since defeated politically—then the repression directed against them began.

It was precisely during this period (1935, 1937, and 1938) that the practice of mass repression through the government apparatus was born, first against the enemies of Leninism—Trotskyites, Zinovievites, Bukharinites, long since politically defeated by the party, and subsequently also against many honest Communists, against those party cadres who had borne the heavy load of the civil war and the first and most difficult years of industrialization and collectivization, who actively fought against the Trotskyites and the rightists for the Leninist party line.

Stalin originated the concept enemy of the people. This term automatically rendered it unnecessary that the ideological errors of a man or men engaged in a controversy be proven; this term made possible the usage of the most cruel repression, violating all norms of revolutionary legality, against anyone who in any way disagreed with Stalin, against those who were only suspected of hostile intent, against those who had had reputations. This concept, enemy of the people, actually eliminated the possibility of any kind of ideological fight or the making of one's views known on this or that issue, even those of a practical character. In the main, and in actuality, the only proof of guilt used, against all norms of current legal science, was the confession of the accused himself, and, as subsequent probing proved, confessions were acquired through physical pressures against the accused.

This led to glaring violations of revolutionary legality, and to the fact that many entirely innocent persons, who in the past had defended the party line, became victims.

We must assert that in regard to those persons who in their time had opposed the party line, there were often no sufficiently serious reasons for their physical annihilation. The formula "enemy of the people" was specifically introduced for the purpose of physically annihilating such individuals.

It is a fact that many persons who were later annihilated as enemies of the party and people had worked with Lenin during his life. Some of these persons had made errors during Lenin's life, but, despite this, Lenin benefited by their work, he corrected them, and he did everything possible to retain them in the ranks of the party; he induced them to follow him.

In this connection the delegates to the party congress should familiarize themselves with an unpublished note by V. I. Lenin directed to the central committee's political bureau in October 1920. Outlining the duties of the control commission, Lenin wrote that the commission should be transformed into a real organ of party and proletarian conscience.

"As a special duty of the control commission there is recommended a deep, individualized relationship with, and sometimes even a type of therapy for, the representatives of the so-called opposition—those who have experienced a psychological crisis because of failure in their soviet or party career. An effort should be made to quiet them, to explain the matter to them in a way used among comrades, to find for them (avoiding the method of issuing orders) a task for which they are psychologically fitted. Advice and rules relating to this matter are to be formulated by the central committee's organizational bureau, etc."

Everyone knows how irreconcilable Lenin was with the ideological enemies of Marxism, with those who deviated from the correct

party line. At the same time, however, Lenin, as is evident from the given document, in his practice of directing the party demanded the most intimate party contact with people who had shown indecision or temporary nonconformity with the party line, but whom it was possible to return to the party path. Lenin advised that such people should be patiently educated without the application of extreme methods.

Lenin's wisdom in dealing with people was evident in his work with cadres.

An entirely different relationship with people characterized Stalin. Lenin's traits—patient work with people; stubborn and painstaking education of them; the ability to induce people to follow him without using compulsion, but rather through the ideological influence on them of the whole collective—were entirely foreign to Stalin. He (Stalin) discarded the Leninist method of convincing and educating; he abandoned the method of ideological struggle for that of administrative violence, mass repressions, and terror. He acted on an increasingly larger scale and more stubbornly through punitive organs, at the same time often violating all existing norms of morality and of Soviet laws.

Arbitrary behavior by one person encouraged and permitted arbitrariness in others. Mass arrests and deportations of many thousands of people, execution without trial and without normal investigation created conditions of insecurity, fear, and even desperation.

This, of course, did not contribute toward unity of the party ranks and of all strata of working people, but on the contrary brought about annihilation and the expulsion from the party of workers who were loyal but inconvenient to Stalin.

Our party fought for the implementation of Lenin's plans for the construction of socialism. This was an ideological fight. Had Leninist principles been observed during the course of this fight, had the party's devotion to principles been skillfully combined with a keen and solicitous concern for people, had they not been repelled and wasted but rather drawn to our side—we certainly would not have had such a brutal violation of revolutionary legality and many thousands of people would not have fallen victim of the method of terror. Extraordinary methods would then have been resorted to only against those people who had in fact committed criminal acts against the Soviet system.

Let us recall some historical facts.

In the days before the October revolution two members of the central committee of the Bolshevik Party—Kamenev and Zinoviev—declared themselves against Lenin's plan for an armed uprising. In addition, on October 18 they published in the *Menshevik* newspaper, *Novaya Zhizn*, a statement declaring that the Bolsheviks were making preparations for an uprising and that they considered it adventurist. Kamenev and Zinoviev thus disclosed to the enemy the decision of the central committee to stage the uprising, and that the uprising had been organized to take place within the very near future.

This was treason against the party and against the revolution. In this connection, V. I. Lenin wrote: "Kamenev and Zinoviev revealed the decision of the central committee of their party on the armed uprising to Rodzyanko and Kerensky * * *". He put before the central committee the question of Zinoviev's and Kamenev's expulsion from the party.

However, after the great Socialist October revolution, as is known, Zinoviev and Kamenev were given leading positions. Lenin put them in positions in which they carried out most responsible party tasks and participated actively in the work of the leading party and Soviet organs. It is known that Zinoviev and Kamenev committed a

number of other serious errors during Lenin's life. In his testament Lenin warned that "Zinoviev's and Kamenev's October episode was of course not an accident." But Lenin did not pose the question of their arrest and certainly not their shooting.

Or let us take the example of the Trotskyites. At present, after a sufficiently long historical period, we can speak about the fight with the Trotskyites with complete calm and can analyze this matter with sufficient objectivity. After all, around Trotsky were people whose origin cannot by any means be traced to bourgeois society. Part of them belonged to the party intelligentsia and a certain part were recruited from among the workers. We can name many individuals who in their time joined the Trotskyites; however, these same individuals took an active part in the workers' movement before the revolution, during the Socialist October revolution itself, and also in the consolidation of the victory of this greatest of revolutions. Many of them broke with Trotskyism and returned to Leninist positions. Was it necessary to annihilate such people? We are deeply convinced that had Lenin lived such an extreme method would not have been used against many of them.

Such are only a few historical facts. But can it be said that Lenin did not decide to use even the most severe means against enemies of the revolution when this was actually necessary? No, no one can say this. Vladimir Ilyich demanded uncompromising dealings with the enemies of the revolution and of the working class and when necessary resorted ruthlessly to such methods. You will recall only V. I. Lenin's fight with the Socialist revolutionary organizers of the anti-Soviet uprising, with the counter-revolutionary kulaks in 1918 and with others, when Lenin without hesitation used the most extreme methods against the enemies. Lenin used such methods, however, only against actual class enemies and not against those who blunder, who err, and whom it was possible to lead through ideological influence, and even retain in the leadership.

Lenin used severe methods only in the most necessary cases, when the exploiting classes were still in existence and were vigorously opposing the revolution, when the struggle for survival was decidedly assuming the sharpest forms, even including a civil war.

Stalin, on the other hand, used extreme methods and mass repressions at a time when the revolution was already victorious, when the Soviet state was strengthened, when the exploiting classes were already liquidated, and Socialist relations were rooted solidly in all phases of national economy, when our party was politically consolidated and had strengthened itself both numerically and ideologically. It is clear that here Stalin showed in a whole series of cases his intolerance, his brutality, and his abuse of power. Instead of proving his political correctness and mobilizing the masses, he often chose the path of repression and physical annihilation, not only against actual enemies, but also against individuals who had not committed any crimes against the party and the Soviet Government. Here we see no wisdom but only a demonstration of the brutal force which had once so alarmed V. I. Lenin.

Lately, especially after the unmasking of the Beriia gang, the Central Committee looked into a series of matters fabricated by this gang. This revealed a very ugly picture of brutal willfulness connected with the incorrect behavior of Stalin. As facts prove, Stalin, using his unlimited power, allowed himself many abuses, acting in the name of the Central Committee, not asking for the opinion of the committee members nor even of the members of the Central Committee's political bureau; often he did not inform them about his personal decisions concerning very important party and government matters.

Considering the question of the cult of an individual we must first of all show everyone what harm this caused to the interests of our party.

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin had always stressed the party's role and significance in the direction of the Socialist government of workers and peasants; he saw in this the chief precondition for a successful building of socialism in our country. Pointing to the great responsibility of the Bolshevik Party, as a ruling party in the Soviet state, Lenin called for the most meticulous observance of all norms of party life; he called for the realization of the principles of collegiality in the direction of the party and the state.

Collegiality of leadership flows from the very nature of our party, a party built on the principles of democratic centralism. "This means," said Lenin, "that all party matters are accomplished by all party members—directly or through representatives—who without any exceptions are subject to the same rules; in addition, all administrative members, all directing collegia, all holders of party positions are elective, they must account for their activities and are recallable."

It is known that Lenin himself offered an example of the most careful observance of these principles. There was no matter so important that Lenin himself decided it without asking for advice and approval of the majority of the Central Committee members or of the members of the Central Committee's political bureau.

In the most difficult period for our party and our country, Lenin considered it necessary regularly to convene congresses, party conferences, and plenary sessions of the Central Committee at which all the most important questions were discussed and where resolutions, carefully worked out by the collective of leaders, were approved.

We can recall, for example, the year 1918 when the country was threatened by the attack of the imperialistic interventionists. In this situation the seventh party congress was convened in order to discuss a vitally important matter which could not be postponed—the matter of peace. In 1919, while the civil war was raging, the eighth party congress convened, which adopted a new party program, decided such important matters as the relationship with the peasant masses, the organization of the Red Army, the leading role of the party in the work of the Soviets, the correction of the social composition of the party, and other matters. In 1920 the ninth party congress was convened which laid down guiding principles pertaining to the party's work in the sphere of economic construction. In 1921 the 10th party congress accepted Lenin's new economic policy and the historical resolution called about party unity.

During Lenin's life party congresses were convened regularly; always when a radical turn in the development of the party and the country took place Lenin considered it absolutely necessary that the party discuss at length all the basic matters pertaining to internal and foreign policy and to questions bearing on the development of party and government.

It is very characteristic that Lenin addressed to the party congress as the highest party organ his last articles, letters, and remarks. During the period between congresses the central committee of the party, acting as the most authoritative leading collective, meticulously observed the principles of the party and carried out its policy.

So it was during Lenin's life.

Were our party's holy Leninist principles observed after the death of Vladimir Ilyich?

Whereas during the first few years after Lenin's death party congresses and central committee plenums took place more or less regularly; later, when Stalin began increasingly to abuse his power, these principles

were brutally violated. This was especially evident during the last 15 years of his life. Was it a normal situation when 13 years elapsed between the 18th and 19th party congresses, years during which our party and our country had experienced so many important events? These events demanded categorically that the party should have passed resolutions pertaining to the country's defense during the patriotic war and to peacetime construction after the war. Even after the end of the war a congress was not convened for over 7 years.

Central committee plenums were hardly ever called. It should be sufficient to mention that during all the years of the patriotic war not a single central committee plenum took place. It is true that there was an attempt to call a central committee plenum in October 1941, when central committee members from the whole country were called to Moscow. They waited 2 days for the opening of the plenum, but in vain. Stalin did not even want to meet and to talk to the central committee members. This fact shows how demoralized Stalin was in the first months of the war and how haughtily and disdainfully he treated the central committee members.

In practice Stalin ignored the norms of party life and trampled on the Leninist principle of collective party leadership.

Stalin's willfulness vis-à-vis the party and its central committee became fully evident after the 17th party congress, which took place in 1934.

Having at its disposal numerous data showing brutal willfulness toward party cadres, the central committee had created a party commission under the control of the central committee presidium; it was charged with investigating what made possible the mass repressions against the majority of the central committee members and candidates elected at the 17th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks).

The commission has become acquainted with a large quantity of materials in the NKVD archives and with other documents and has established many facts pertaining to the fabrication of cases against Communists, to false accusations, to glaring abuses of Socialist legality, which resulted in the death of innocent people. It became apparent that many party, Soviet, and economic activists, who were branded in 1937-38 as enemies, were actually never enemies, spies, wreckers, etc., but were always honest Communists; they were only so stigmatized, and often no longer able to bear barbaric tortures, they charged themselves (at the order of the investigative judges—falsifiers) with all kinds of grave and unlikely crimes. The commission has presented to the central committee presidium lengthy and documented materials pertaining to mass repressions against the delegates to the 17th party congress and against members of the central committee elected at that congress. These materials have been studied by the presidium of the central committee.

It was determined that of the 139 members and candidates of the party's Central Committee who were elected at the 17th congress, 98 persons, that is, 70 percent, were arrested and shot (mostly in 1937-38). [Indignation in the hall.]

What was the composition of the delegates to the 17th congress? It is known that 80 percent of the voting participants of the 17th congress joined the party during the years of conspiracy before the revolution and during the civil war; this means before 1921. By social origin the basic mass of the delegates to the congress were workers (60 percent of the voting members).

For this reason, it was inconceivable that a congress so composed would have elected a central committee a majority of whom would prove to be enemies of the party.

The only reason why 70 percent of central committee members and candidates elected at the 17th congress were branded as enemies of the party and of the people was because honest Communists were slandered, accusations against them were fabricated, and revolutionary legality was gravely undetermined.

The same fate met not only the central committee members but also the majority of the delegates to the 17th party congress. Of 1,966 delegates with either voting or advisory rights, 1,108 persons were arrested on charges of antirevolutionary crimes, i. e., decidedly more than a majority. This very fact shows how absurd, wild, and contrary to commonsense were the charges of counter-revolutionary crimes made out, as we now see, against a majority of participants at the 17th party congress. [Indignation in the hall.]

We should recall that the 17th party congress is historically known as the Congress of Victors. Delegates to the congress were active participants in the building of our Socialist state; many of them suffered and fought for party interests during the pre-revolutionary years in the conspiracy and at the civil war fronts; they fought their enemies valiantly and often nervelessly looked into the face of death. How then can we believe that such people could prove to be two-faced and had joined the camps of the enemies of socialism during the era after the political liquidation of Zinovievites, Trotskyites, and rightists and after the great accomplishments of Socialist construction?

This was the result of the abuse of power by Stalin, who began to use mass terror against the party cadres.

What is the reason that mass repressions against activists increased more and more after the 17th party congress? It was because at that time Stalin had so elevated himself above the party and above the nation that he ceased to consider either the central committee or the party. While he still reckoned with the opinion of the collective before the 17th congress, after the complete political liquidation of the Trotskyites, Zinovievites and Bukharinites, when as a result of that fight and Socialist victories the party achieved unity, Stalin ceased to an ever greater degree to consider the members of the party's central committee and even the members of the Political Bureau. Stalin thought that now he could decide all things alone and all he needed were statisticians; he treated all others in such a way that they could only listen to and praise him.

After the criminal murder of S. M. Kirov, mass repressions and brutal acts of violation of Socialist legality began. On the evening of December 1, 1934, on Stalin's initiative (without the approval of the Political Bureau—which was passed 2 days later, casually) the Secretary of the Presidium of the Central Executive Committee, Yenukidze, signed the following directive:

"I. Investigative agencies are directed to speed up the cases of those accused of the preparation or execution of acts of terror.

"II. Judicial organs are directed not to hold up the execution of death sentences pertaining to crimes of this category in order to consider the possibility of pardon, because the Presidium of the Central Executive Committee, U. S. S. R., does not consider as possible the receiving of petitions of this sort.

"III. The organs of the Commissariat of Internal Affairs are directed to execute the death sentences against criminals of the above-mentioned category immediately after the passage of sentences."

This directive became the basis for mass acts of abuse against Socialist legality. During many of the fabricated court cases the accused were charged with "the preparation"

of terroristic acts; this deprived them of any possibility that their cases might be reexamined, even when they stated before the court that their confessions were secured by force, and when, in a convincing manner, they disproved the accusations against them.

It must be asserted that to this day the circumstances surrounding Kirov's murder hide many things which are inexplicable and mysterious and demand a most careful examination. There are reasons for the suspicion that the killer of Kirov, Nikolayev, was assisted by someone from among the people whose duty it was to protect the person of Kirov. A month and a half before the killing Nikolayev was arrested on the grounds of suspicious behavior, but he was released and not even searched. It is an unusually suspicious circumstance that when the Chekist assigned to protect Kirov was being brought for an interrogation, on December 2, 1934, he was killed in a car accident in which no other occupants of the car were harmed. After the murder of Kirov, top functionaries of the Leningrad NKVD were given very light sentences, but in 1937 they were shot. We can assume that they were shot in order to cover the traces of the organizers of Kirov's killing. [Movement in the hall.]

Mass repressions grew tremendously from the end of 1936 after a telegram from Stalin and Zhdanov, dated from Sochi on September 25, 1936, was addressed to Kaganovich, Molotov, and other members of the Political Bureau. The content of the telegram was as follows:

"We deem it absolutely necessary and urgent that Comrade Yezhov be nominated to the post of People's Commissar for Internal Affairs. Yagoda has definitely proved himself to be incapable of unmasking the Trotskyite-Zinovievite bloc. The OGPU is 4 years behind in this matter. This is noted by all party workers and by the majority of the representatives of the NKVD." Strictly speaking we should stress that Stalin did not meet with and therefore could not know the opinion of party workers.

This Stalinist formulation that the "NKVD (term used interchangeably with 'OGPU')¹ is 4 years behind" in applying mass repression and that there is a necessity for catching up with the neglected work directly pushed the NKVD workers on the path of mass arrests and executions.

We should state that this formulation was also forced on the February-March plenary session of the central committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) in 1937. The plenary resolution approved it on the basis of Yezhov's report, "Lessons flowing from the harmful activity, diversion, and espionage of the Japanese-German-Trotskyite agents," stating: "The plenum of the central committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) considers that all facts revealed during the investigation into the matter of an anti-Soviet Trotskyite center and of its followers in the provinces show that the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs has fallen behind at least 4 years in the attempt to unmask these most inextinguishable enemies of the people."

The mass repressions at this time were made under the slogan of a fight against the Trotskyites. Did the Trotskyites at this time actually constitute such a danger to our party and to the Soviet state? We should recall that in 1927, on the eve of the 15th party congress, only some 4,000 votes were cast for the Trotskyite-Zinovievite opposition, while there were 724,000 for the party line. During the 10 years which passed between the 15th party congress and the February-March central committee plenum, Trotskyism was completely disarmed; many former Trotskyites had changed their former views and worked in the various sectors

building socialism. It is clear that in the situation of Socialist victory there was no basis for mass terror in the country.

Stalin's report at the February-March central committee plenum in 1937, "Deficiencies of party work and methods for the liquidation of the Trotskyites and of other two-facers," contained an attempt at theoretical justification of the mass terror policy under the pretext that as we march forward toward socialism class war must allegedly sharpen. Stalin asserted that both history and Lenin taught him this.

Actually Lenin taught that the application of revolutionary violence is necessitated by the resistance of the exploiting classes, and this referred to the era when the exploiting classes existed and were powerful. As soon as the nation's political situation had improved, when in January 1920 the Red Army took Rostov and thus won a most important victory over Denikin, Lenin instructed Dzerzhinsky to stop mass terror and to abolish the death penalty. Lenin justified this important political move of the Soviet state in the following manner in his report at the session of the All-Union central executive committee on February 2, 1920:

"We were forced to use terror because of the terror practiced by the Entente, when strong world powers threw their hordes against us, not avoiding any type of conduct. We would not have lasted 2 days had we not answered these attempts of officers and White Guardists in a merciless fashion; this meant the use of terror, but this was forced upon us by the terrorist methods of the Entente."

"But as soon as we attained a decisive victory, even before the end of the war, immediately after taking Rostov, we gave up the use of the death penalty and thus proved that we intend to execute our own program in the manner that we promised. We say that the application of violence flows out of the decision to smother the exploiters, the big landowners, and the capitalists; as soon as this was accomplished we gave up the use of all extraordinary methods. We have proved this in practice."

Stalin deviated from these clear and plain precepts of Lenin. Stalin put the party and the NKVD up to the use of mass terror when the exploiting classes had been liquidated in our country and when there were no serious reasons for the use of extraordinary mass terror.

This terror was actually directed not at the remnants of the defeated exploiting classes but against the honest workers of the party and of the Soviet state; against them were made lying, slanderous, and absurd accusations concerning two-facedness, espionage, sabotage, preparation of fictitious plots, and so forth.

At the February-March central committee plenum in 1937, many members actually questioned the rightness of the established course regarding mass repressions under the pretext of combating two-facedness.

Comrade Postyshev most ably expressed these doubts. He said:

"I have philosophized that the severe years have passed, party members who have lost their backbones have broken down or have joined the camp of the enemy; healthy elements have fought for the party. These were the years of industrialization and collectivization. I never thought it possible that after this severe era had passed Karpov and people like him would find themselves in the camp of the enemy. (Karpov was a worker in the Ukrainian Central Committee whom Postyshev knew well.) And now, according to the testimony, it appears that Karpov was recruited in 1934 by the Trotskyites. I personally do not believe that in 1934 an honest party member who had trod the long road of unrelenting fight against enemies for the party and for socialism, would now be in the camp of the enemies. I do not believe it * * *."

I cannot imagine how it would be possible to travel with the party during the difficult years and then, in 1934, join the Trotskyites. It is an odd thing * * *." [Movement in the hall.]

Using Stalin's formulation, namely, that the closer we are to socialism the more enemies we will have, and using the resolution of the February-March Central Committee plenum passed on the basis of Yezhov's report—the provocateurs who had infiltrated the state security organs together with conscienceless careerists began to protect with the party name the mass terror against party cadres, cadres of the Soviet state and the ordinary Soviet citizens. It should suffice to say that the number of arrests based on charges of counterrevolutionary crimes had grown 10 times between 1936 and 1937.

It is known that brutal willfulness was practiced against leading party workers. The party statute, approved at the 17th party congress, was based on Leninist principles expressed at the 10th party congress. It stated that in order to apply an extreme method such as exclusion from the party against a central committee member, against a central committee candidate, and against a member of the party control commission, "it is necessary to call a central committee plenum and to invite to the plenum all Central Committee candidate members and all members of the party control commission"; only if two-thirds of the members of such a general assembly of responsible party leaders find it necessary, only then can a central committee member or candidate be expelled.

The majority of the Central Committee members and candidates elected at the 17th congress and arrested in 1937-38 were expelled from the party illegally through the brutal abuse of the party statute, because the question of their expulsion was never studied at the Central Committee plenum.

Now when the cases of some of these so-called spies and saboteurs were examined it was found that all their cases were fabricated. Confessions of guilt of many arrested and charged with enemy activity were gained with the help of cruel and inhuman tortures.

At the same time Stalin, as we have been informed by members of the Political Bureau of that time, did not show them the statements of many accused political activists when they retracted their confessions before the military tribunal and asked for an objective examination of their cases. There were many such declarations, and Stalin doubtlessly knew of them.

The central committee considers it absolutely necessary to inform the congress of many such fabricated cases against the members of the party's central committee elected at the 17th party congress.

An example of vile provocation of odious falsification and of criminal violation of revolutionary legality is the case of the former candidate for the central committee political bureau, one of the most eminent workers of the party and of the Soviet Government, Comrade Eikhé, who was a party member since 1905. [Commotion in the hall.]

Comrade Eikhé was arrested on April 29, 1938, on the basis of slanderous materials, without the sanction of the prosecutor of the U. S. S. R., which was finally received 15 months after the arrest.

Investigation of Eikhé's case was made in a manner which most brutally violated Soviet legality and was accompanied by willfulness and falsification.

Eikhé was forced under torture to sign ahead of time a protocol of his confession prepared by the investigative judges, in which he and several other eminent party workers were accused of anti-Soviet activity.

On October 1, 1939, Eikhé sent his declaration to Stalin in which he categorically

¹The content of this parenthesis is an editorial note of the translator.

denied his guilt and asked for an examination of his case. In the declaration he wrote: "There is no more bitter misery than to sit in the jail of a government for which I have always fought."

A second declaration of Elkhe has been preserved which he sent to Stalin on October 27, 1939; in it he cited facts very convincingly and countered the slanderous accusations made against him, arguing that this provocative accusation was on the one hand the work of real Trotskyites whose arrests he had sanctioned as First Secretary of the West Siberian Krai Party Committee and who conspired in order to take revenge on him, and, on the other hand, the result of the base falsification of materials by the investigative judges.

Elkhe wrote in his declaration: " * * * On October 25 of this year I was informed that the investigation in my case has been concluded and I was given access to the materials of this investigation. Had I been guilty of only one-hundredth of the crimes with which I am charged, I would not have dared to send you this preexecution declaration; however, I have not been guilty of even one of the things with which I am charged and my heart is clean of even the shadow of baseness. I have never in my life told you a word of falsehood and now, finding my two feet in the grave, I am also not lying. My whole case is a typical example of provocation, slander and violation of the elementary basis of revolutionary legality * * * ."

" * * * The confessions which were made part of my file are not only absurd but contain some slander toward the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) and toward the Council of People's Commissars because correct resolutions of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) and of the Council of People's Commissars which were not made on my initiative and without my participation are presented as hostile acts of counterrevolutionary organizations made at my suggestion * * * ."

"I am now alluding to the most disgraceful part of my life and to my really grave guilt against the party and against you. This is my confession of counterrevolutionary activity * * * . The case is as follows: not being able to suffer the tortures to which I was submitted by Ushakov and Nikolayev—and especially by the first one—who utilized the knowledge that my broken ribs have not properly mended and have caused me great pain—I have been forced to accuse myself and others."

"The majority of my confession has been suggested or dictated by Ushakov, and the remainder is my reconstruction of NKVD materials from western Siberia for which I assumed all responsibility. If some part of the story which Ushakov fabricated and which I signed did not properly hang together, I was forced to sign another variation. The same thing was done to Rukhimovich, who was at first designated as a member of the reserve net and whose name later was removed without telling me anything about it; the same was also done with the leader of the reserve net, supposedly created by Bukharin in 1935. At first I wrote my name in, and then I was instructed to insert Mezhlauk. There were other similar incidents."

"I am asking and begging you that you again examine my case and this not for the purpose of sparing me but in order to unmask the vile provocation which like a snake wound itself around many persons in a great degree due to my meanness and criminal slander. I have never betrayed you or the party. I know that I perish because of vile and mean work of the enemies of the party and of the people, who fabricated the provocation against me."

It would appear that such an important declaration was worth an examination by the Central Committee. This, however, was not

done and the declaration was transmitted to Beriya while the terrible maltreatment of the Political Bureau candidate, Comrade Elkhe, continued.

On February 2, 1940, Elkhe was brought before the court. Here he did not confess any guilt and said as follows:

"In all the so-called confessions of mine there is not one letter written by me with the exception of my signatures under the protocols which were forced from me. I have made my confession under pressure from the investigative judge who from the time of my arrest tormented me. After that I began to write all this nonsense. The most important thing for me is to tell the court, the party and Stalin that I am not guilty. I have never been guilty of any conspiracy. I will die believing in the truth of party policy as I have believed in it during my whole life."

On February 4 Elkhe was shot. [Indignation in the hall.] It has been definitely established now that Elkhe's case was fabricated; he has been posthumously rehabilitated.

Comrade Rudzutak, candidate member of the Political Bureau, member of the party since 1905, who spent 10 years in a Czarist hard labor camp, completely retracted in court the confession which was forced from him. The protocol of the session of the Collegium of the Supreme Military Court contains the following statement by Rudzutak:

"The only plea which he places before the court is that the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) be informed that there is in the NKVD an as yet not liquidated center which is craftily manufacturing cases, which forces innocent persons to confess; there is no opportunity to prove one's nonparticipation in crimes to which the confessions of various persons testify. The investigative methods are such that they force people to lie and to slander entirely innocent persons in addition to those who already stand accused. He asks the court that he be allowed to inform the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) about all this in writing. He assures the court that he personally never had any evil designs in regard to the policy of our party because he had always agreed with the party policy pertaining to all spheres of economic and cultural activity."

This declaration of Rudzutak was ignored, despite the fact that Rudzutak was in his time the chief of the Central Control Commission which was called into being in accordance with Lenin's concept for the purpose of fighting for party union. In this manner fell the chief of this highly authoritative party organ, a victim of brutal willfulness; he was not even called before the Central Committee's Political Bureau because Stalin did not want to talk to him. Sentence was pronounced on him in 20 minutes and he was shot. [Indignation in the hall.]

After careful examination of the case in 1955 it was established that the accusation against Rudzutak was false and that it was based on slanderous materials. Rudzutak has been rehabilitated posthumously.

The way in which the former NKVD workers manufactured various fictitious "anti-Soviet centers" and "blobs" with the help of provocative methods is seen from the confession of Comrade Rozenblum, party member since 1906, who was arrested in 1937 by the Leningrad NKVD.

During the examination in 1955 of the Komarov case Rozenblum revealed the following fact: when Rozenblum was arrested in 1937 he was subjected to terrible torture during which he was ordered to confess false information concerning himself and other persons. He was then brought to the office of Zakovsky, who offered him freedom on condition that he make before the court a false confession fabricated in 1937 by the NKVD concerning "sabotage, espionage and

diversion in a terroristic center in Leningrad." [Movement in the hall.] With unbelievable cynicism Zakovsky told about the vile "mechanism" for the crafty creation of fabricated "anti-Soviet plots."

"In order to illustrate it to me," stated Rozenblum, "Zakovsky gave me several possible variants of the organization of this center and of its branches. After he detailed the organization to me, Zakovsky told me that the NKVD would prepare the case of this center, remarking that the trial would be public."

"Before the court were to be brought 4 or 5 members of this center: Chudov, Ugarov, Smorodin, Pozern, Shaposhnikova (Chudov's wife) and others together with 2 or 3 members from the branches of this center. * * *"

" * * * The case of the Leningrad center has to be built solidly and for this reason witnesses are needed. Social origin (of course, in the past) and the party standing of the witness will play more than a small role."

"You, yourself," said Zakovsky, "will not need to invent anything. The NKVD will prepare for you a ready outline for every branch of the center; you will have to study it carefully and to remember well all questions and answers which the court might ask. This case will be ready in 4-5 months, or perhaps a half year. During all this time you will be preparing yourself so that you will not compromise the investigation and yourself. Your future will depend on how the trial goes and on its results. If you begin to lie and to testify falsely, blame yourself. If you manage to endure it, you will save your head and we will feed and clothe you at the government's cost until your death."

This is the kind of vile things which were then practiced. [Movement in the hall.]

Even more widely was the falsification of cases practiced in the provinces. The NKVD headquarters of the Sverdlov oblast discovered the so-called Ural uprising staff—an organ of the bloc of rightists, Trotskyites, Socialist Revolutionaries, church leaders—whose chief supposedly was the secretary of the Sverdlov Oblast Party Committee and member of the Central Committee, All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), Kabakov, who had been a party member since 1914. The investigative materials of that time show that in almost all kraia, oblasts, and republics there supposedly existed rightist Trotskyites, espionage-terror and diversionary-sabotage organizations and centers and that the heads of such organizations as a rule—for no known reason—were first secretaries of oblast or republic Communist Party committees or central committees. [Movement in the hall.]

Many thousands of honest and innocent Communists have died as a result of this monstrous falsification of such cases, as a result of the fact that all kinds of slanderous confessions were accepted, and as a result of the practice of forcing accusations against oneself and others. In the same manner were fabricated the cases against eminent party and state workers—Kossior, Chubar, Postyshev, Kosaryev, and others.

In those years repressions on a mass scale were applied which were based on nothing tangible and which resulted in heavy cadre losses to the party.

The vicious practice was condoned of having the NKVD prepare lists of persons whose cases were under the jurisdiction of the military collegium and whose sentences were prepared in advance. Yezhov would send these lists to Stalin personally for his approval of the proposed punishment. In 1937-38, 383 such lists containing the names of many thousands of party, Soviet, Kom-somol, army, and economic workers were sent to Stalin. He approved these lists.

A large part of these cases are being reviewed now and a great part of them are

being voided because they were baseless and falsified. Suffice it to say that from 1954 to the present time the military collegium of the supreme court has rehabilitated 7,679 persons, many of whom were rehabilitated posthumously.

Mass arrests of party, Soviet, economic, and military workers caused tremendous harm to our country and to the cause of Socialist advancement.

Mass repressions had a negative influence on the moral-political condition of the party, created a situation of uncertainty, contributed to the spreading of unhealthy suspicion, and sowed distrust among Communists. All sorts of slanderers and careerists were active.

Resolutions of the January plenum of the central committee, All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), in 1938 had brought some measure of improvement to the party organizations. However, widespread repression also existed in 1938.

Only because our party has at its disposal such great moral-political strength was it possible for it to survive the difficult events in 1937-38 and to educate new cadres. There is, however, no doubt that our march forward toward Socialism and toward the preparation of the country's defense would have been much more successful were it not for the tremendous loss in the cadres suffered as a result of the baseless and false mass repressions in 1937-38.

We are justly accusing Yezhov for the degenerate practices of 1937. But we have to answer these questions: Could Yezhov have arrested Kossior, for instance, without the knowledge of Stalin? Was there an exchange of opinions or a Political Bureau decision concerning this? No, there was not, as there was none regarding other cases of this type. Could Yezhov have decided such important matters as the fate of such eminent party figures? No, it would be a display of naivete to consider this the work of Yezhov alone. It is clear that these matters were decided by Stalin, and that without his orders and his sanction Yezhov could not have done this.

We have examined the cases and have rehabilitated Kossior, Rudzutak, Postyshev, Kosaryev, and others. For what causes were they arrested and sentenced? The review of evidence shows that there was no reason for this. They, like many others, were arrested without the prosecutor's knowledge. In such a situation there is no need for any sanction, for what sort of a sanction could there be when Stalin decided everything. He was the chief prosecutor in these cases. Stalin not only agreed to, but on his own initiative issued arrest orders. We must say this so that the delegates to the congress can clearly undertake and themselves assess this and draw the proper conclusions.

Facts prove that many abuses were made on Stalin's orders without reckoning with any norms of party and Soviet legality. Stalin was a very distrustful man, sickly suspicious; we knew this from our work with him. He could look at a man and say: "Why are your eyes so shifty today," or "Why are you turning so much today and avoiding to look me directly in the eyes?" The sickly suspicion created in him a general distrust even toward eminent party workers whom he had known for years. Everywhere and in everything he saw enemies, "two-facers" and spies.

Possessing unlimited power he indulged in great willfulness and choked a person morally and physically. A situation was created where one could not express one's own will.

When Stalin said that one or another should be arrested, it was necessary to accept on faith that he was an "enemy of the people." Meanwhile, Beriya's gang, which ran the organs of state security, outdid itself in proving the guilt of the arrested and the truth of materials which it falsified. And what proofs were offered? The confessions

of the arrested, and the investigative judges accepted these confessions. And how is it possible that a person confesses to crimes which he has not committed? Only in one way, because of application of physical methods of pressuring him, tortures, bringing him to a state of unconsciousness, deprivation of his judgment, taking away of his human dignity. In this manner were confessions acquired.

When the wave of mass arrests began to recede in 1939, and the leaders of territorial party organizations began to accuse the NKVD workers of using methods of physical pressure on the arrested, Stalin dispatched a coded telegram on January 20, 1939, to the committee secretaries of oblasts and krais, to the central committees of republic Communist Parties, to the Peoples Commissars of Internal Affairs and to the heads of NKVD organizations. This telegram stated:

"The Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) explains that the application of methods of physical pressure in NKVD practice is permissible from 1937 on in accordance with permission of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks). . . . It is known that all bourgeois intelligence services use methods of physical influence against the representatives of the Socialist proletariat and that they use them in their most scandalous forms. The question arises as to why the Socialist intelligence service should be more humanitarian against the mad agents of the bourgeoisie, against the deadly enemies of the working class and of the Kolkhoz workers. The Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) considers that physical pressure should still be used obligatorily, as an exception applicable to known and obstinate enemies of the people, as a method both justifiable and appropriate."

Thus, Stalin had sanctioned in the name of the central committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) the most brutal violations of Socialist legality, torture, and oppression, which led as we have seen to the slandering and self-accusation of innocent people.

Not long ago—only several days before the present congress—we called to the Central Committee Presidium session and interrogated the investigative judge, Rodos, who in his time investigated and interrogated Kossior, Chubar, and Kosaryev. He is a vile person, with the brain of a bird, and morally completely degenerate. And it was this man who was deciding the fate of prominent party workers; he was making judgments also concerning the politics in these matters, because having established their "crime," he provided therewith materials from which important political implications could be drawn.

The question arises whether a man with such an intellect could alone make the investigation in a manner to prove the guilt of people such as Kossior and others. No; he could not have done it without proper directives. At the Central Committee Presidium session he told us: "I was told that Kossior and Chubar were people's enemies and for this reason, I, as an investigative judge, had to make them confess that they are enemies." [Indignation in the hall.]

He could do this only through long tortures, which he did, receiving detailed instructions from Beriya. We must say that at the Central Committee Presidium session he cynically declared: "I thought that I was executing the orders of the party." In this manner Stalin's orders concerning the use of methods of physical pressure against the arrested were in practice executed.

These and many other facts show that all norms of correct party solution of problems were invalidated and everything was dependent upon the willfulness of one man.

The power accumulated in the hands of one person, Stalin, led to serious consequences during the great patriotic war.

When we look at many of our novels, films, and historical scientific studies, the role of Stalin in the patriotic war appears to be entirely improbable. Stalin had foreseen everything. The Soviet Army, on the basis of a strategic plan prepared by Stalin long before, used the tactics of so-called active defense, i. e., tactics which, as we know, allowed the Germans to come up to Moscow and Stalingrad. Using such tactics, the Soviet Army, supposedly, thanks only to Stalin's genius, turned to the offensive and subdued the enemy. The epic victory gained through the armed might of the land of the Soviets, through our heroic people, is ascribed in this type of novel, film, and scientific study as being completely due to the strategic genius of Stalin.

We have to analyze this matter carefully because it has a tremendous significance, not only from the historical but especially from the political, educational, and practical point of view.

What are the facts of this matter? Before the war our press and all our political-educational work was characterized by its bragging tone: When an enemy violates the holy Soviet soil, then for every blow of the enemy we will answer with three blows, and we will battle the enemy on his soil and we will win without much harm to ourselves. But these positive statements were not based in all areas on concrete facts which would actually guarantee the immunity of our borders.

During the war and after the war, Stalin put forward the thesis that the tragedy which our nation experienced in the first part of the war was the result of the unexpected attack of the Germans against the Soviet Union. But, comrades, this is completely untrue. As soon as Hitler came to power in Germany he assigned to himself the task of liquidating communism. The Fascists were saying this openly; they did not hide their plans. In order to attain this aggressive end, all sorts of pacts and blocs were created, such as the famous Berlin-Rome-Tokyo Axis. Many facts from the prewar period clearly showed that Hitler was going all out to begin a war against the Soviet state and that he had concentrated large armed units, together with armored units, near the Soviet borders.

Documents which have now been published show that by April 3, 1941, Churchill, through his Ambassador to the U. S. S. R., Cripps, personally warned Stalin that the Germans had begun regrouping their armed units with the intent of attacking the Soviet Union. It is self-evident that Churchill did not do this at all because of his friendly feeling toward the Soviet nation. He had in this his own imperialistic goals—to bring Germany and the U. S. S. R. into a bloody war and thereby to strengthen the position of the British Empire. Just the same, Churchill affirmed in his writings that he sought to warn Stalin and call his attention to the danger which threatened him. Churchill stressed this repeatedly in his dispatches of April 18 and in the following days. However, Stalin took no heed of these warnings. What is more, Stalin ordered that no credence be given to information of this sort, in order not to provoke the initiation of military operations.

We must assert that information of this sort concerning the threat of German armed invasion of Soviet territory was coming in also from our own military and diplomatic sources; however, because the leadership was conditioned against such information, such data was dispatched with fear and assessed with reservation.

Thus, for instance, information sent from Berlin on May 6, 1941, by the Soviet military attaché, Captain Vorontsov, stated: "Soviet citizen Bozer . . . communicated to the deputy naval attaché that according to a statement of a certain German officer from Hitler's headquarters, Germany is preparing

to invade the U. S. S. R. on May 14 through Finland, the Baltic countries, and Latvia. At the same time Moscow and Leningrad will be heavily raided and paratroopers landed in border cities. * * *

In his report of May 22, 1941, the deputy military attaché in Berlin, Khlopov, communicated that " * * * the attack of the German Army is reportedly scheduled for June 15, but it is possible that it may begin in the first days of June. * * * "

A cable from our London Embassy dated 18 June 1941 stated: "As of now Cripps is deeply convinced of the inevitability of armed conflict between Germany and the U. S. S. R., which will begin not later than the middle of June. According to Cripps, the Germans have presently concentrated 147 divisions (including air force and service units) along the Soviet borders."

Despite these particularly grave warnings, the necessary steps were not taken to prepare the country properly for defense and to prevent it from being caught unawares.

Did we have time and the capabilities for such preparations? Yes; we had the time and capabilities. Our industry was already so developed that it was capable of supplying fully the Soviet Army with everything that it needed. This is proven by the fact that although during the war we lost almost half of our industry and important industrial and food-production areas as the result of enemy occupation of the Ukraine, Northern Caucasus, and other western parts of the country, the Soviet Nation was still able to organize the production of military equipment in the eastern parts of the country, install there equipment taken from the western industrial areas, and to supply our armed forces with everything which was necessary to destroy the enemy.

Had our industry been mobilized properly and in time to supply the army with the necessary materiel, our wartime losses would have been decidedly smaller. Such mobilization had not been, however, started in time. And already in the first days of the war it became evident that our Army was badly armed, that we did not have enough artillery, tanks, and planes to throw the enemy back.

Soviet science and technology produced excellent models of tanks and artillery pieces before the war. But mass production of all this was not organized, and as a matter of fact we started to modernize our military equipment only on the eve of the war. As a result, at the time of the enemy's invasion of the Soviet land we did not have sufficient quantities either of old machinery which was no longer used for armament production or of new machinery which we had planned to introduce into armament production. The situation with antiaircraft artillery was especially bad; we did not organize the production of antitank ammunition. Many fortified regions had proven to be indefensible as soon as they were attacked, because the old arms had been withdrawn and new ones were not yet available there.

This pertained, alas, not only to tanks, artillery and planes. At the outbreak of the war we did not even have sufficient numbers of rifles to arm the mobilized manpower. I recall that in those days I telephoned Comrade Malenkov from Kiev and told him, "People have volunteered for the new army and demand arms. You must send us arms."

Malenkov answered me, "We cannot send you arms. We are sending all our rifles to Leningrad and you have to arm yourselves." [Movement in the hall.]

Such was the armament situation.

In this connection we cannot forget, for instance, the following fact. Shortly before the invasion of the Soviet Union by the Hitlerite army, Korponos, who was chief of the Kiev special military district (he was later killed at the front) wrote to Stalin that the German armies were at the Bug River, were preparing for an attack and in the very

near future would probably start their offensive. In this connection Korponos proposed that a strong defense be organized, that 300,000 people be evacuated from the border areas and that several strong points be organized there: Antitank ditches, trenches for the soldiers, etc.

Moscow answered this proposition with the assertion that this would be a provocation, that no preparatory defensive work should be undertaken at the borders, that the Germans were not to be given any pretext for the initiation of military action against us. Thus, our borders were insufficiently prepared to repel the enemy.

When the Fascist armies had actually invaded Soviet territory and military operations began, Moscow issued the order that the German fire was not to be returned. Why? It was because Stalin, despite evident facts, thought that the war had not yet started, that this was only a provocative action on the part of several undisciplined sections of the German army, and that our reaction might serve as a reason for the Germans to begin the war.

The following fact is also known. On the eve of the invasion of the territory of the Soviet Union by the Hitlerite army a certain German citizen crossed our border and stated that the German armies had received orders to start the offensive against the Soviet Union on the night of June 22 at 3 o'clock. Stalin was informed about this immediately, but even this warning was ignored.

As you see, everything was ignored; warnings of certain army commanders, declarations of deserters from the enemy army, and even the open hostility of the enemy. Is this an example of the alertness of the chief of the party and of the state at this particularly significant historical moment?

And what were the results of this carefree attitude, this disregard of clear facts? The result was that already in the first hours and days the enemy had destroyed in our border regions a large part of our air force, artillery, and other military equipment; he annihilated large numbers of our military cadres and disorganized our military leadership; consequently we could not prevent the enemy from marching deep into the country.

Very grievous consequences, especially in reference to the beginning of the war, followed Stalin's annihilation of many military commanders and political workers during 1937-41 because of his suspiciousness and through slanderous accusations. During these years repressions were instituted against certain parts of military cadres beginning literally at the company and battalion commander level and extending to the higher military centers; during this time the cadre of leaders who had gained military experience in Spain and in the Far East was almost completely liquidated.

The policy of large-scale repression against the military cadres led also to undermined military discipline, because for several years officers of all ranks and even soldiers in the party and Komsomol cells were taught to unmask their superiors as hidden enemies. [Movement in the hall.] It is natural that this caused a negative influence on the state of military discipline in the first war period.

And, as you know, we had before the war excellent military cadres which were unquestionably loyal to the party and to the fatherland. Suffice it to say that those of them who managed to survive despite severe tortures to which they were subjected in the prisons, have from the first war days shown themselves real patriots and heroically fought for the glory of the fatherland; I have here in mind such comrades as Rokossovsky (who, as you know, had been jailed), Gorbатов, Maretskov (who is a delegate at the present Congress), Podlas (he was an excellent commander who perished

at the front), and many, many others. However, many such commanders perished in camps and jails and the army saw them no more.

All this brought about the situation which existed at the beginning of the war and which was the great threat to our fatherland.

It would be incorrect to forget that after the first severe disaster and defeats at the front Stalin thought that this was the end. In one of his speeches in those days he said: "All that which Lenin created we have lost forever."

After this Stalin for a long time actually did not direct the military operations and ceased to do anything whatever. He returned to active leadership only when some members of the Political Bureau visited him and told him that it was necessary to take certain steps immediately in order to improve the situation at the front.

Therefore, the threatening danger which hung over our fatherland in the first period of the war was largely due to the faulty methods of directing the nation and the party by Stalin himself.

However, we speak not only about the moment when the war began, which led to serious disorganization of our army and brought us severe losses. Even after the war began, the nervousness and hysteria which Stalin demonstrated, interfering with actual military operations, caused our army serious damage.

Stalin was very far from an understanding of the real situation which was developing at the front. This was natural because during the whole patriotic war he never visited any section of the front or any liberated city except for one short ride on the Mozhaisk Highway during a stabilized situation at the front. To this incident were dedicated many literary works full of fantasies of all sorts and so many paintings. Simultaneously, Stalin was interfering with operations and issuing orders which did not take into consideration the real situation at a given section of the front and which could not help but result in huge personnel losses.

I will allow myself in this connection to bring out one characteristic fact which illustrates how Stalin directed operations at the fronts. There is present at this Congress Marshal Bagramyan, who was once the chief of operations in the headquarters of the southwestern front and who can corroborate what I will tell you.

When there developed an exceptionally serious situation for our army in 1942 in the Kharkov region, we had correctly decided to drop an operation whose objective was to encircle Kharkov, because the real situation at that time would have threatened our army with fatal consequences if this operation were continued.

We communicated this to Stalin, stating that the situation demanded changes in operational plans so that the enemy would be prevented from liquidating a sizable concentration of our army.

Contrary to common sense, Stalin rejected our suggestion and issued the order to continue the operation aimed at the encirclement of Kharkov, despite the fact that at this time many army concentrations were themselves actually threatened with encirclement and liquidation.

I telephoned to Vasilevsky and begged him—

"Alexander Mikhailovich, take a map (Vasilevsky is present here) and show Comrade Stalin the situation which has developed." We should note that Stalin planned operations on a globe. [Animation in the hall.] Yes, comrades, he used to take the globe and trace the front line on it. I said to Comrade Vasilevsky: "Show him the situation on a map; in the present situation we cannot continue the operation which was planned. The old decision must be changed for the good of the cause."

Vasilevsky replied saying that Stalin had already studied this problem and that he, Vasilevsky, would not see Stalin further concerning this matter, because the latter didn't want to hear any arguments on the subject of this operation.

After my talk with Vasilevsky I telephoned to Stalin at his villa. But Stalin did not answer the telephone and Malenkov was at the receiver. I told Comrade Malenkov that I was calling from the front and that I wanted to speak personally to Stalin. Stalin informed me through Malenkov that I should speak with Malenkov. I stated for the second time that I wished to inform Stalin personally about the grave situation which had arisen for us at the front. But Stalin did not consider it convenient to raise the phone and again stated that I should speak to him through Malenkov, although he was only a few steps from the telephone.

After listening in this manner to our plea Stalin said, "Let everything remain as it is."

And what was the result of this? The worst that we had expected. The Germans surrounded our army concentrations and consequently we lost hundreds of thousands of our soldiers. This is Stalin's military genius; this is what it cost us. [Movement in the hall.]

On one occasion after the war, during a meeting of Stalin with members of the political bureau, Anastas Ivanovich Mikoyan mentioned that Khrushchev must have been right when he telephoned concerning the Kharkov operation and that it was unfortunate that his suggestion had not been accepted.

You should have seen Stalin's fury. How could it be admitted that he, Stalin, had not been right. He is after all a genius, and a genius cannot help but be right? Everyone can err, but Stalin considered that he never erred, that he was always right. He never acknowledged to anyone that he made any mistake, large or small, despite the fact that he made not a few mistakes in the matter of theory and in his practical activity. After the party congress we shall probably have to reevaluate many wartime military operations and to present them in their true light.

The tactics on which Stalin insisted without knowing the essence of the conduct of battle operations cost us much blood until we succeeded in stopping the opponent and going over to the offensive.

The military know that already by the end of 1941 instead of great operational maneuvers flanking the opponent and penetrating behind his back, Stalin demanded incessant frontal attacks and the capture of one village after another. Because of this we paid with great losses until our generals, on whose shoulders rested the whole weight of conducting the war, succeeded in changing the situation and shifting to flexible maneuver operations, which immediately brought serious changes at the front favorable to us.

All the more shameful was the fact that after our great victory over the enemy which cost us so much, Stalin began to downgrade many of the commanders who contributed so much to the victory over the enemy, because Stalin excluded every possibility that services rendered at the front should be credited to anyone but himself.

Stalin was very much interested in the assessment of Comrade Zhukov as a military leader. He asked me often for my opinion of Zhukov. I told him then, "I have known Zhukov for a long time; he is a good general and a good military leader."

After the war Stalin began to tell all kinds of nonsense about Zhukov, among others the following, "You praised Zhukov, but he does not deserve it. It is said that before each operation at the front Zhukov used to behave as follows: He used to take a handful of earth, smell it, and say, 'We can begin the attack,' or the opposite, 'the

planned operation cannot be carried out.'" I stated at that time, "Comrade Stalin, I do not know who invented this, but it is not true."

It is possible that Stalin himself invented these things for the purpose of minimizing the role and military talents of Marshal Zhukov.

In this connection Stalin very energetically popularized himself as a great leader; in various ways he tried to inculcate in the people the version that all victories gained by the Soviet nation during the great patriotic war were due to the courage, daring, and genius of Stalin and of no one else. Exactly like Kuzma Kryuchkov (a famous Cossack who performed heroic feats against the Germans),² he put one dress on seven people at the same time. [Animation in the hall.]

In the same vein, let us take, for instance, our historical and military films and some literary creations; they make us feel sick. Their true objective is the propagation of the theme of praising Stalin as a military genius. Let us recall the film, *The Fall of Berlin*. Here only Stalin acts; he issues orders in the hall in which there are many empty chairs and only one man approached him and reports something to him—that is Poskrebyshchev, his loyal shield bearer. [Laughter in the hall.]

And where is the military command? Where is the political bureau? Where is the government? What are they doing and with what are they engaged? There is nothing about them in the film. Stalin acts for everybody; he does not reckon with anyone; he asks no one for advice. Everything is shown to the nation in this false light. Why? In order to surround Stalin with glory, contrary to the facts and contrary to historical truth.

The question arises: And where are the military on whose shoulders rested the burden of the war? They are not in the film; with Stalin in, no room was left for them.

But Stalin, but the party as a whole, the Soviet Government, our heroic army, its talented leaders and brave soldiers, the whole Soviet nation—these are the ones who assured the victory in the great patriotic war. [Tempestuous and prolonged applause.]

The Central Committee members, ministers, our economic leaders, leaders of Soviet culture, directors of territorial party and Soviet organizations, engineers, and technicians—everyone of them in his own place of work generously gave of his strength and knowledge toward ensuring victory over the enemy.

Exceptional heroism was shown by our hard core—surrounded by glory is our whole working class, our Kolkhoz peasantry, the Soviet intelligentsia, who under the leadership of party organizations overcame untold hardships and, bearing the hardships of war, devoted all their strength to the cause of the defense of the fatherland.

Great and brave deeds during the war were accomplished by our Soviet women who bore on their backs the heavy load of production work in the factories, on the kolkhozes, and in various economic and cultural sectors; many women participated directly in the great patriotic war at the fronts; our brave youth contributed immeasurably at the front and at home to the defense of the Soviet fatherland and to the annihilation of the enemy.

Immortal are the services of the Soviet soldiers, of our commanders and political workers of all ranks; after the loss of a considerable part of the army in the first war months they did not lose their heads and were able to reorganize during the progress of combat; they created and toughened during the progress of the war a strong and heroic army and not only stood off pressure

of the strong and cunning enemy but also smashed him.

The magnificent and heroic deeds of hundreds of millions of people of the East and of the West during the fight against the threat of Fascist subjugation which loomed before us will live centuries and millennia in the memory of thankful humanity. [Thunderous applause.]

The main role and the main credit for the victorious ending the war belongs to our Communist Party, to the armed forces of the Soviet Union, and to the tens of millions of Soviet people raised by the party. [Thunderous and prolonged applause.]

Comrades, let us reach for some other facts. The Soviet Union is justly considered as a model of a multinational state because we have in practice assured the equality and friendship of all nations which live in our great fatherland.

All the more monstrous are the acts whose initiator was Stalin and which are rude violations of the basic Leninist principles of the nationality policy of the Soviet state. We refer to the mass deportations from their native places of whole nations, together with all Communists and Komsomols without any exception; this deportation action was not dictated by any military considerations.

Thus, already at the end of 1943, when there occurred a permanent breakthrough at the fronts of the Great Patriotic War benefiting the Soviet Union, a decision was taken and executed concerning the deportation of all the Karachai from the lands on which they lived. In the same period, at the end of December 1943, the same lot befell the whole population of the Autonomous Kalmyk Republic. In March 1944 all the Chechen and Ingush peoples were deported and the Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Republic was liquidated. In April 1944, all Balkars were deported to faraway places from the territory of the Kabardino-Balkar Autonomous Republic and the Republic itself was renamed the Autonomous Kabardian Republic. The Ukrainians avoided meeting this fate only because there were too many of them and there was no place to which to deport them. Otherwise, he would have deported them also. [Laughter and animation in the hall.]

Not only a Marxist-Leninist but also no man of commonsense can grasp how it is possible to make whole nations responsible for inimical activity, including women, children, old people, Communists, and Komsomols, to use mass repression against them, and to expose them to misery and suffering for the hostile acts of individual persons or groups of persons.

After the conclusion of the patriotic war the Soviet nation stressed with pride the magnificent victories gained through great sacrifices and tremendous efforts. The country experienced a period of political enthusiasm. The party came out of the war even more united; in the fire of the war party cadres were tempered and hardened. Under such conditions nobody could have even thought of the possibility of some plot in the party.

And it was precisely at this time that the so-called Leningrad affair was born. As we have now proven, this case was fabricated. Those who innocently lost their lives included Comrades Voznesensky, Kuznetsov, Rodionov, Popkov, and others.

As is known, Voznesensky and Kuznetsov were talented and eminent leaders. Once they stood very close to Stalin. It is sufficient to mention that Stalin made Voznesensky first deputy to the chairman of the council of ministers, and Kuznetsov was elected secretary of the Central Committee. The very fact that Stalin entrusted Kuznetsov with the supervision of the state security organs shows the trust which he enjoyed.

How did it happen that these persons were branded as enemies of the people and liquidated?

² The content of this parenthesis is an editorial comment of the translator.

Facts prove that the Leningrad affair is also the result of willfulness which Stalin exercised against party cadres.

Had a normal situation existed in the party's Central Committee and in the central committee political bureau, affairs of this nature would have been examined there in accordance with party practice, and all pertinent facts assessed; as a result such an affair as well as others would not have happened.

We must state that after the war the situation became even more complicated. Stalin became even more capricious, irritable, and brutal; in particular his suspicion grew. His persecution mania reached unbelievable dimensions. Many workers were becoming enemies before his very eyes. After the war Stalin separated himself from the collective even more. Everything was decided by him alone without any consideration for anyone or anything.

This unbelievable suspicion was cleverly taken advantage of by the abject provocateur and vile enemy, Beriya, who had murdered thousands of Communists and loyal Soviet people. The elevation of Voznesensky and Kuznetsov alarmed Beriya. As we have now proven, it had been precisely Beriya who had suggested to Stalin the fabrication by him and by his confidants of materials in the form of declarations and anonymous letters, and in the form of various rumors and talks.

The party's central committee has examined this so-called Leningrad affair; persons who innocently suffered are now rehabilitated and honor has been restored to the glorious Leningrad party organization. Abakumov and others who had fabricated this affair were brought before a court; their trial took place in Leningrad and they received what they deserved.

The question arises: Why is it that we see the truth of this affair only now, and why did we not do something earlier, during Stalin's life, in order to prevent the loss of innocent lives? It was because Stalin personally supervised the Leningrad affair, and the majority of the Political Bureau members did not, at that time, know all of the circumstances in these matters, and could not therefore intervene.

When Stalin received certain materials from Beriya and Abakumov, without examining these slanderous materials, he ordered an investigation of the affair of Voznesensky and Kuznetsov. With this their fate was sealed. Instructive in the same way is the case of the Mingrelian nationalist organization which supposedly existed in Georgia. As is known, resolutions by the central committee, Communist Party of the Soviet Union, were made concerning this case in November 1951 and in March 1952. These resolutions were made without prior discussion with the Political Bureau. Stalin had personally dictated them. They made serious accusations against many loyal Communists. On the basis of falsified documents it was proven that there existed in Georgia a supposedly nationalistic organization whose objective was the liquidation of the Soviet power in that republic with the help of imperialist powers.

In this connection, a number of responsible party and Soviet workers were arrested in Georgia. As was later proven, this was a slander directed against the Georgian party organization.

We know that there have been at times manifestations of local bourgeois nationalism in Georgia as in several other republics. The question arises: Could it be possible that in the period during which the resolutions referred to above were made, nationalist tendencies grew so much that there was a danger of Georgia's leaving the Soviet Union and joining Turkey? [Animation in the hall, laughter.]

This is, of course, nonsense. It is impossible to imagine how such assumptions could enter anyone's mind. Everyone knows how

Georgia has developed economically and culturally under Soviet rule.

Industrial production of the Georgian Republic is 27 times greater than it was before the revolution. Many new industries have arisen in Georgia which did not exist there before the revolution: from smelting, an oil industry, a machine construction industry, etc. Illiteracy has long since been liquidated, which, in prerevolutionary Georgia, included 78 percent of the population.

Could the Georgians, comparing the situation in their republic with the hard situation of the working masses in Turkey, be aspiring to join Turkey? In 1955 Georgia produced 18 times as much steel per person as Turkey. Georgia produces 9 times as much electrical energy per person as Turkey. According to the available 1950 census, 65 percent of Turkey's total population are illiterate, and of the women, 80 percent are illiterate. Georgia has 19 institutions of higher learning which have about 39,000 students; this is 8 times more than in Turkey (for each 1,000 inhabitants). The prosperity of the working people has grown tremendously in Georgia under Soviet rule.

It is clear that as the economy and culture develop, and as the Socialist consciousness of the working masses in Georgia grows, the source from which bourgeois nationalism draws its strength evaporates.

As it developed, there was no nationalistic organization in Georgia. Thousands of innocent people fell victim of willfulness and lawlessness. All of this happened under the "genial" leadership of Stalin, "the great son of the Georgian nation," as Georgians liked to refer to Stalin. [Animation in the hall.]

The willfulness of Stalin showed itself not only in decisions concerning the internal life of the country but also in the international relations of the Soviet Union.

The July plenum of the Central Committee studied in detail the reasons for the development of conflict with Yugoslavia. It was a shameful role which Stalin played here. The "Yugoslav affair" contained no problems which could not have been solved through party discussions among comrades. There was no significant basis for the development of this "affair"; it was completely possible to have prevented the rupture of relations with that country. This does not mean, however, that the Yugoslav leaders did not make mistakes or did not have shortcomings. But these mistakes and shortcomings were magnified in a monstrous manner by Stalin, which resulted in a break of relations with a friendly country.

I recall the first days when the conflict between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia began artificially to be blown up. Once, when I came from Kiev to Moscow, I was invited to visit Stalin who, pointing to the copy of a letter lately sent to Tito, asked me, "Have you read this?"

Not waiting for my reply he answered, "I will shake my little finger and there will be no more Tito. He will fall."

We have dearly paid for this "shaking of the little finger." This statement reflected Stalin's mania for greatness, but he acted just that way: "I shall shake my little finger and there will be no Kossior"; "I will shake my little finger once more and Postyshev and Chubar will be no more"; "I will shake my little finger again and Voznesensky, Kuznetsov and many others will disappear."

But this did not happen to Tito. No matter how much or how little Stalin shook, not only his little finger but everything else that he could shake, Tito did not fall. Why? The reason was that, in this case of disagreement with the Yugoslav comrades, Tito had behind him a state and a people who had gone through a severe school of fighting for liberty and independence, a people which gave support to its leaders.

You see to what Stalin's mania for greatness led. He had completely lost conscious-

ness of reality; he demonstrated his suspicion and haughtiness not only in relation to individuals in the U. S. S. R., but in relation to whole parties and nations.

We have carefully examined the case of Yugoslavia and have found a proper solution which is approved by the peoples of the Soviet Union and of Yugoslavia as well as by the working masses of all the people's democracies and by all progressive humanity. The liquidation of the abnormal relationship with Yugoslavia was done in the interest of the whole camp of socialism, in the interest of strengthening peace in the whole world.

Let us also recall the affair of the doctor plotters. [Animation in the hall.] Actually there was no affair outside of the declaration of the woman doctor Timashuk, who was probably influenced or ordered by someone (after all, she was an unofficial collaborator of the organs of state security) to write Stalin a letter in which she declared that doctors were applying supposedly improper methods of medical treatment.

Such a letter was sufficient for Stalin to reach an immediate conclusion that there are doctor plotters in the Soviet Union. He issued orders to arrest a group of eminent Soviet medical specialists. He personally issued advice on the conduct of the investigation and the method of interrogation of the arrested persons. He said that the academician Vinogradov should be put in chains, another one should be beaten. Present at this Congress as a delegate is the former Minister of State Security Comrade Ignatiev. Stalin told him curtly, "If you do not obtain confessions from the doctors we will shorten you by a head." [Tumult in the hall.]

Stalin personally called the investigative judge, gave him instructions, advised him on which investigative methods should be used; these methods were simple—beat, beat and, once again, beat.

Shortly after the doctors were arrested we members of the Political Bureau received protocols with the doctors; confessions of guilt. After distributing these protocols Stalin told us, "You are blind like young kittens; what will happen without me? The country will perish because you do not know how to recognize enemies."

The case was so presented that no one could verify the facts on which the investigation was based. There was no possibility of trying to verify facts by contacting those who had made the confessions of guilt.

We felt, however, that the case of the arrested doctors was questionable. We knew some of these people personally because they had once treated us. When we examined this case after Stalin's death, we found it to be fabricated from beginning to end.

This ignominious case was set up by Stalin; he did not, however, have the time in which to bring it to an end (as he conceived that end), and for this reason the doctors are still alive. Now all have been rehabilitated; they are working in the same places they were working before; they treat top individuals, not excluding members of the Government; they have our full confidence; and they execute their duties honestly, as they did before.

In organizing the various dirty and shameful cases, a very base role was played by the rabid enemy of our party, an agent of a foreign intelligence service—Beriya, who had stolen into Stalin's confidence. In what way could this provocateur gain such a position in the party and in the State, so as to become the First Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union and a member of the Central Committee Political Bureau? It has now been established that this villain had climbed up the government ladder over an untold number of corpses.

Were there any signs that Beriya was an enemy of the party? Yes; there were.

Already in 1937, at a Central Committee plenum, former People's Commissar of Health Protection Kaminsky said that Beriia worked for the Mussavat intelligence service. But the Central Committee plenum had barely concluded when Kaminsky was arrested and then shot. Had Stalin examined Kaminsky's statement? No; because Stalin believed in Beriia, and that was enough for him. And when Stalin believed in anyone or anything, then no one could say anything which was contrary to his opinion; anyone who would dare to express opposition would have met the same fate as Kaminsky.

There were other signs also. The declaration which Comrade Snegov made at the party's Central Committee is interesting. (Parenthetically speaking, he was also rehabilitated not long ago, after 17 years in prison camps.) In this declaration Snegov writes:

"In connection with the proposed rehabilitation of the former Central Committee member, Kartvelishvili-Lavrentiev, I have entrusted to the hands of the representative of the committee of state security a detailed deposition concerning Beriia's role in the disposition of the Kartvelishvili case and concerning the criminal motives by which Beriia was guided."

In my opinion, it is indispensable to recall an important fact pertaining to this case and to communicate it to the Central Committee, because I did not consider it as proper to include in the investigation documents.

On October 30, 1931, at the session of the organizational bureau of the Central Committee, All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), Kartvelishvili, secretary of the trans-Caucasian Krai committee, made a report. All members of the executive of the Krai committee were present; of them I alone am alive. During this session J. V. Stalin made a motion at the end of his speech concerning the organization of the secretariat of the trans-Caucasian Krai committee, composed of the following: First secretary, Kartvelishvili; second secretary, Beriia (it was then for the first time in the party's history that Beriia's name was mentioned as a candidate for a party position). Kartvelishvili answered that he knew Beriia well and for that reason refused categorically to work together with him. Stalin proposed then that this matter be left open and that it be solved in the process of the work itself. Two days later a decision was arrived at that Beriia would receive the party post and that Kartvelishvili would be deported from the trans-Caucasus.

This fact can be confirmed by Comrades Mikoyan and Kaganovich who were present at that session.

The long unfriendly relations between Kartvelishvili and Beriia were widely known; they date back to the time when Comrade Sergo³ was active in the Trans-Caucasus; Kartvelishvili was the closest assistant of Sergo. The unfriendly relationship impelled Beriia to fabricate a case against Kartvelishvili.

It is a characteristic thing that in this case Kartvelishvili was charged with a terrorist act against Beriia.

The indictment in the Beriia case contains a discussion of his crimes. Some things should, however, be recalled, especially since it is possible that not all delegates to the Congress have read this document. I wish to recall Beriia's bestial disposition of the cases of Kedrov, Golubev, and Golubev's adopted mother, Baturina—persons who wished to inform the Central Committee concerning Beriia's treacherous activity. They were shot without any trial and the sentence was passed *ex post facto*, after the execution.

³ Translator's note: "Sergo" was the popular nickname for Ordzhonikidze.

Here is what the old Communist, Comrade Kedrov, wrote to the Central Committee through Comrade Andreyev (Comrade Andreyev was then a Central Committee secretary):

"I am calling to you for help from a gloomy cell of the Lefortorsky prison. Let my cry of horror reach your ears; do not remain deaf; take me under your protection; please, help remove the nightmare of interrogations and show that this is all a mistake.

"I suffer innocently. Please believe me. Time will testify to the truth. I am not an agent-provocateur of the Tsarish Okhrana; I am not a spy; I am not a member of an anti-Soviet organization of which I am being accused on the basis of denunciations. I am also not guilty of any other crimes against the party and the Government. I am an old Bolshevik, free of any stain; I have honestly fought for almost 40 years in the ranks of the party for the good and the prosperity of the nation. * * *

"Today I, a 62-year-old man, am being threatened by the investigative judges with more severe, cruel, and degrading methods of physical pressure. They (the judges) are no longer capable of becoming aware of their error and of recognizing that their handling of my case is illegal and impermissible. They try to justify their actions by picturing me as a hardened and raving enemy and are demanding increased repressions. But let the party know that I am innocent and that there is nothing which can turn a loyal son of the party into an enemy, even right up to his last dying breath.

"But I have no way out. I cannot divert from myself the hastily approaching new and powerful blows.

"Everything, however, has its limits. My torture has reached the extreme. My health is broken, my strength and my energy are waning, the end is drawing near. To die in a Soviet prison, branded as a vile traitor to the fatherland—what can be more monstrous for an honest man. And how monstrous all this is. Unsurpassed bitterness and pain grips my heart. No. No. This will not happen; this cannot be, I cry. Neither the party, nor the Soviet government, nor the people's commissar, L. P. Beriia, will permit this cruel irreparable injustice. I am firmly certain that given a quiet, objective examination, without any foul rantings, without any anger and without the fearful tortures, it would be easy to prove the baselessness of the charges. I believe deeply that truth and justice will triumph. I believe. I believe."

The old Bolshevik, Comrade Kedrov, was found innocent by the military collegium. But despite this, he was shot at Beriia's order. [Indignation in the hall.]

Beriia also handled cruelly the family of Comrade Ordzhonikidze. Why? Because Ordzhonikidze had tried to prevent Beriia from realizing his shameful plans. Beriia had cleared from his way all persons who could possibly interfere with him. Ordzhonikidze was always an opponent of Beriia, which he told to Stalin. Instead of examining this affair and taking appropriate steps, Stalin allowed the liquidation of Ordzhonikidze's brother and brought Ordzhonikidze himself to such a state that he was forced to shoot himself. [Indignation in the hall.] Such was Beriia.

Beriia was unmasked by the party's central committee shortly after Stalin's death. As a result of the particularly detailed legal proceedings it was established that Beriia had committed monstrous crimes and Beriia was shot.

The question arises why Beriia, who had liquidated tens of thousands of party and Soviet workers, was not unmasked during Stalin's life. He was not unmasked earlier because he had utilized very skillfully Stalin's weaknesses; feeding him with suspicions, he assisted Stalin in everything and acted with his support.

Comrades, the cult of the individual acquired such monstrous size chiefly because Stalin himself, using all conceivable methods, supported the glorification of his own person. This is supported by numerous facts. One of the most characteristic examples of Stalin's self-glorification and of his lack of even elementary modesty is the edition of his Short Biography, which was published in 1948.

This book is an expression of the most dissolute flattery, an example of making a man into a godhead, of transforming him into an infallible sage, "the greatest leader," "sublime strategist of all times and nations." Finally no other words could be found with which to lift Stalin up to the heavens.

We need not give here examples of the loathsome adulation filling this book. All we need to add is that they all were approved and edited by Stalin personally and some of them were added in his own handwriting to the draft text of the book.

What did Stalin consider essential to write into this book? Did he want to cool the ardor of his flatterers who were composing his Short Biography? No. He marked the very places where he thought that the praise of his services was insufficient.

Here are some examples characterizing Stalin's activity, added in Stalin's own hand:

"In this fight against the skeptics and capitulators, the Trotskyites, Zinovievites, Bukharinites, and Kamenevites, there was definitely welded together, after Lenin's death, that leading core of the party⁴ that upheld the great banner of Lenin, rallied the party behind Lenin's behests, and brought the Soviet people into the broad road of industrializing the country and collectivizing the rural economy. The leader of this core and the guiding force of the party and the state was Comrade Stalin."

Thus writes Stalin himself. Then he adds: "Although he performed his task of leader of the party and the people with consummate skill and enjoyed the unreserved support of the entire Soviet people, Stalin never allowed his work to be marred by the slightest hint of vanity, conceit, or self-adulation."

Where and when could a leader so praise himself? Is this worthy of a leader of the Marxist-Leninist type? No. Precisely against this did Marx and Engels take such a strong position. This also was always sharply condemned by Vladimir Ilyich Lenin.

In the draft text of his book appeared the following sentence: "Stalin is the Lenin of today." This sentence appeared to Stalin to be too weak, so in his own handwriting he changed it to read: "Stalin is the worthy continuer of Lenin's work, or, as it is said in our party, Stalin is the Lenin of today." You see how well it is said, not by the nation but by Stalin himself.

It is possible to give many such self-praising appraisals written into the draft text of that book in Stalin's hand. Especially generously does he endow himself with praises pertaining to his military genius, to his talent for strategy.

I will cite one more insertion made by Stalin concerning the theme of the Stalinist military genius.

"The advanced Soviet science of war received further development," he writes, "at Comrade Stalin's hands. Comrade Stalin elaborated the theory of the permanently operating factors that decide the issue of wars, of active defense, and the laws of counter-offensive and offensive, of the cooperation of all services and arms in modern warfare, of

⁴ Omitted portion of list as found in A Short Biography, by Joseph Stalin, Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1949, p. 89, is as follows: " * * * consisting of Stalin, Molotov, Kalinin, Voroshilov, Kulbyshev, Frunze, Dzerzhinsky, Kaganovich, Ordzhonikidze, Kirov, Yaroslavsky, Mikoyan, Andreyev, Shvernik, Zhdanov, Shkiryatov, and others."

the role of big tank masses and air forces in modern war, and of the artillery as the most formidable of the armed services. At the various stages of the war Stalin's genius found the correct solutions that took account of all the circumstances of the situation." [Movement in the hall.]

And further, writes Stalin:

"Stalin's military mastership was displayed both in defense and offense. Comrade Stalin's genius enabled him to divine the enemy's plans and defeat them. The battles in which Comrade Stalin directed the Soviet armies are brilliant examples of operational military skill."

In this manner was Stalin praised as a strategist. Who did this? Stalin himself, not in his role as a strategist but in the role of an author-editor, one of the main creators of his self-adulatory biography.

Such, comrades, are the facts. We should rather say shameful facts.

And one additional fact from the same short biography of Stalin. As is known, the Short Course of the History of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), was written by a commission of the party central committee.

This book, parenthetically, was also permeated with the cult of the individual and was written by a designated group of authors. This fact was reflected in the following formulation on the proof copy of the Short Biography of Stalin:

"A commission of the central committee, All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), under the direction of Comrade Stalin and with his most active personal participation, has prepared a Short Course of the History of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks)."

But even this phrase did not satisfy Stalin: The following sentence replaced it in the final version of the "Short Biography":

"In 1938 appeared the book, History of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), Short Course, written by Comrade Stalin and approved by a commission of the central committee, All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks)." Can one add anything more? [Animation in the hall.]

As you see, a surprising metamorphosis changed the work created by a group into a book written by Stalin. It is not necessary to state how and why this metamorphosis took place.

A pertinent question comes to our mind: If Stalin is the author of this book, why did he need to praise the person of Stalin so much and to transform the whole post-October historical period of our glorious Communist Party solely into an action of "the Stalin genius"?

Did this book properly reflect the efforts of the party in the Socialist transformation of the country, in the construction of Socialist society, in the industrialization and collectivization of the country, and also other steps taken by the party which undeviatingly traveled the path outlined by Lenin? This book speaks principally about Stalin, about his speeches, about his reports. Everything without the smallest exception is tied to his name.

And when Stalin himself asserts that he himself wrote the Short Course of the History of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), this calls at least for amazement. Can a Marxist-Leninist thus write about himself, praising his own person to the heavens?

Or let us take the matter of the Stalin prizes. [Movement in the hall.] Not even the Tsars created prizes which they named after themselves.

Stalin recognized as the best a text of the national anthem of the Soviet Union which contains not a word about the Com-

munist Party; it contains, however, the following unprecedented praise of Stalin:

"Stalin brought us up in loyalty to the people. He inspired us to great toll and acts."

In these lines of the anthem is the whole educational, directional, and inspirational activity of the great Leninist Party ascribed to Stalin. This is, of course, a clear deviation from Marxism-Leninism, a clear debasing and belittling of the role of the party. We should add for your information that the Presidium of the Central Committee has already passed a resolution concerning the composition of a new text of the anthem, which will reflect the role of the people, and the role of the party. [Loud, prolonged applause.]

And was it without Stalin's knowledge that many of the largest enterprises and towns were named after him? Was it without his knowledge that Stalin monuments were erected in the whole country—these memorials to the living? It is a fact that Stalin himself had signed on July 2, 1951, a resolution of the U. S. S. R. Council of Ministers concerning the erection on the Volga-Don Canal of an impressive monument to Stalin; on September 4 of the same year he issued an order making 33 tons of copper available for the construction of this impressive monument. Anyone who has visited the Stalingrad area must have seen the huge statue which is being built there, and that on a site which hardly any people frequent. Huge sums were spent to build it at a time when people of this area had lived since the war in huts. Consider yourself, was Stalin right when he wrote in his biography that " . . . he did not allow in himself . . . even a shadow of conceit, pride, or self-adoration?"

At the same time Stalin gave proofs of his lack of respect for Lenin's memory. It is not a coincidence that, despite the decision taken over 30 years ago to build a palace of Soviets as a monument to Vladimir Ilyich, this palace was not built, its construction was always postponed, and the project allowed to lapse.

We cannot forget to recall the Soviet Government resolution of August 14, 1925, concerning the founding of Lenin prizes for educational work. This resolution was published in the press, but until this day there are no Lenin prizes. This, too, should be corrected. [Tumultuous, prolonged applause.]

During Stalin's life, thanks to known methods which I have mentioned, and quoting facts, for instance, from the Short Biography of Stalin—all events were explained as if Lenin played only a secondary role, even during the October Socialist Revolution. In many films and in many literary works, the figure of Lenin was incorrectly presented and inadmissibly depreciated.

Stalin loved to see the film, The Unforgettable Year of 1919, in which he was shown on the steps of an armored train and where he was practically vanquishing the foe with his own sabre. Let Kliment Yefremovich, our dear friend, find the necessary courage and write the truth about Stalin; after all, he knows how Stalin had fought. It will be difficult for Comrade Voroshilov to undertake this, but it would be good if he did it. Everyone will approve of it, both the people and the party. Even his grandsons will thank him. [Prolonged applause.]

In speaking about the events of the October Revolution and about the civil war, the impression was created that Stalin always played the main role, as if everywhere and always Stalin had suggested to Lenin what to do and how to do it. However, this is slander of Lenin. [Prolonged applause.]

I will probably not sin against the truth when I say that 99 percent of the persons present here heard and knew very little about Stalin before the year 1924, while Lenin was known to all he was known to the whole

party, to the whole nation, from the children up to the graybeards. [Tumultuous, prolonged applause.]

All this has to be thoroughly revised, so that history, literature, and the fine arts properly reflect V. I. Lenin's role and the great deeds of our Communist Party and of the Soviet people—the creative people. [Applause.]

Comrades, the cult of the individual has caused the employment of faulty principles in party work and in economic activity; it brought about rule violation of internal party and Soviet democracy, sterile administration, deviations of all sorts, covering up of shortcomings and varnishing of reality. Our nation gave birth to many flatterers and specialists in false optimism and deceit.

We should also not forget that due to the numerous arrests of party, Soviet and economic leaders, many workers began to work uncertainly, showed overcautiousness, feared all which was new, feared their own shadows and began to show less initiative in their work.

Take, for instance, party and Soviet resolutions. They were prepared in a routine manner often without considering the concrete situation. This went so far that party workers, even during the smallest sessions, read their speeches. All this produced the danger of formalizing the party and Soviet work and of bureaucratizing the whole apparatus.

Stalin's reluctance to consider life's realities and the fact that he was not aware of the real state of affairs in the provinces can be illustrated by his direction of agriculture.

All those who interested themselves even a little in the national situation saw the difficult situation in agriculture, but Stalin never even noted it. Did we tell Stalin about this? Yes, we told him, but he did not support us. Why? Because Stalin never traveled anywhere, did not meet city and Kolkhoz workers; he did not know the actual situation in the provinces.

He knew the country and agriculture only from films. And these films had dressed up and beautified the existing situation in agriculture.

Many films so pictured Kolkhoz life that the tables were bending from the weight of turkeys and geese. Evidently Stalin thought that it was actually so.

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin looked at life differently; he was always close to the people; he used to receive peasant delegates, and often spoke at factory gatherings; he used to visit villages and talk with the peasants.

Stalin separated himself from the people and never went anywhere. This lasted tens of years. The last time he visited a village was in January 1928 when he visited Siberia in connection with grain deliveries. How then could he have known the situation in the provinces?

And when he was once told during a discussion that our situation on the land was a difficult one and that the situation of cattle breeding and meat production was especially bad, a commission was formed which was charged with the preparation of a resolution called, "Means toward further development of animal breeding in Kolkhozes and Sovkhozoes." We worked out this project.

Of course, our propositions of that time did not contain all possibilities, but we did characterize ways in which animal breeding on the Kolkhozes and Sovkhozoes would be raised. We had proposed then to raise the prices of such products in order to create material incentives for the Kolkhoz, MTS, and Sovkhoz workers in the development of cattle breeding. But our project was not accepted and in February 1953 was laid aside entirely.

What is more, while reviewing this project Stalin proposed that the taxes paid by the Kolkhozes and by the Kolkhoz workers should be raised by 40 billion rubles; according to

him the peasants are well-off and the Kolkhoz worker would need to sell only one more chicken to pay his tax in full.

Imagine what this meant. Certainly 40 billion rubles is a sum which the Kolkhoz workers did not realize for all the products which they sold to the Government. In 1952 for instance, the Kolkhozes and the Kolkhoz workers received 26,280,000,000 rubles for all their products delivered and sold to the Government.

Did Stalin's position then rest on data of any sort whatever? Of course not.

In such cases facts and figures did not interest him. If Stalin said anything, it meant it was so—after all, he was a genius and a genius does not need to count, he only needs to look and can immediately tell how it should be. When he expresses his opinion, everyone has to repeat it and to admire his wisdom.

But how much wisdom was contained in the proposal to raise the agricultural tax by 40 billion rubles. None, absolutely none, because the proposal was not based on an actual assessment of the situation but on the fantastic ideas of a person divorced from reality. We are currently beginning slowly to work our way out of a difficult agricultural situation. The speeches of the delegates to the 20th congress please us all; we are glad that many delegates deliver speeches, that there are conditions for the fulfillment of the sixth 5-year plan for animal husbandry, not during the period of 5 years, but within 2 to 3 years. We are certain that the commitments of the new 5-year plan will be accomplished successfully. [Prolonged applause.]

Comrades, if we sharply criticize today the cult of the individual which was so widespread during Stalin's life and if we speak about the many negative phenomena generated by this cult which is so alien to the spirit of Marxism-Leninism, various persons may ask: How could it be? Stalin headed the party and the country for 30 years and many victories were gained during his lifetime. Can we deny this? In my opinion, the question can be asked in this manner only by those who are blinded and hopelessly hypnotized by the cult of the individual, only by those who do not understand the essence of the revolution and of the Soviet State, only by those who do not understand, in a Leninist manner, the role of the party and of the nation in the development of the Soviet society.

The Socialist revolution was attained by the working class and by the poor peasantry with the partial support of middle-class peasants. It was attained by the people under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party. Lenin's great service consisted of the fact that he created a militant party of the working class, but he was armed with Marxist understanding of the laws of social development and with the science of proletarian victory in the fight with capitalism, and he steered this party in the crucible of revolutionary struggle of the masses of the people. During this fight the party consistently defended the interests of the people, became its experienced leader, and led the working masses to power, to the creation of the first Socialist state.

You remember well the wise words of Lenin that the Soviet State is strong because of the awareness of the masses that history is created by the millions and tens of millions of people.

Our historical victories were attained thanks to the organizational work of the party, to the many provincial organizations, and to the self-sacrificing work of our great nation. These victories are the result of the great drive and activity of the nation and of the party as a whole; they are not at all the fruit of the leadership of Stalin, as the situation was pictured during the period of the cult of the individual.

If we are to consider this matter of Marxists and as Leninists, then we have to state unequivocally that the leadership practice which came into being during the last years of Stalin's life became a serious obstacle in the path of Soviet social development.

Stalin often failed for months to take up some unusually important problems concerning the life of the party and of the state whose solution could not be postponed. During Stalin's leadership our peaceful relations with other nations were often threatened, because one-man decisions could cause and often did cause great complications.

In the last years, when we managed to free ourselves of the harmful practice of the cult of the individual and took several proper steps in the sphere of internal and external policies, everyone saw how activity grew before their very eyes, how the creative activity of the broad working masses developed, how favorably all this acted upon the development of economy and of culture. [Applause.]

Some comrades may ask us: Where were the members of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee? Why did they not assert themselves against the cult of the individual in time? And why is this being done only now?

First of all we have to consider the fact that the members of the Political Bureau viewed these matters in a different way at different times. Initially, many of them backed Stalin actively because Stalin was one of the strongest Marxists and his logic, his strength, and his will greatly influenced the cadres and party work.

It is known that Stalin, after Lenin's death, especially during the first years, actively fought for Leninism against the enemies of Leninist theory and against those who deviated. Beginning with Leninist theory, the party, with its Central Committee at the head, started on a great scale the work of Socialist industrialization of the country, agricultural collectivization, and the cultural revolution. At that time Stalin gained great popularity, sympathy, and support. The party had to fight those who attempted to lead the country away from the correct Leninist path; it had to fight Trotskyites, Zinovievites, and rightists, and the bourgeois nationalists. This fight was indispensable. Later, however, abusing his power more and more, began to fight eminent party and government leaders and to use terroristic methods against honest Soviet people. As we have already shown, Stalin thus handled such eminent party and government leaders as Kossior, Rudzutak, Elkhé, Postyshev, and many others.

Attempts to oppose groundless suspicions and charges resulted in the opponent falling victim of the repression. This characterized the fall of Comrade Postyshev.

In one of his speeches Stalin expressed his dissatisfaction with Postyshev and asked him, "What are you actually?"

Postyshev answered clearly, "I am a Bolshevik, Comrade Stalin, a Bolshevik."

This assertion was at first considered to show a lack of respect for Stalin; later it was considered a harmful act and consequently resulted in Postyshev's annihilation and branding without any reason as a people's enemy.

In the situation which then prevailed I have talked often with Nikolai Aleksandrovich Bulgakov; once, when we two were traveling in a car, he said, "It has happened sometimes that a man goes to Stalin on his invitation as a friend. And when he sits with Stalin he does not know where he will be sent next—home or to jail."

It is clear that such conditions put every member of the Political Bureau in a very difficult situation. And when we also consider the fact that in the last years the Central Committee plenary sessions were not convened, and that the sessions of the Political Bureau occurred only occasionally,

from time to time, then we will understand how difficult it was for any member of the Political Bureau to take a stand against one or another unjust or improper procedure, against serious errors and shortcomings in the practices of leadership.

As we have already shown, many decisions were taken either by one person or in a roundabout way, without collective discussions. The sad fate of Political Bureau member, Comrade Voznesensky, who fell victim to Stalin's repressions, is known to all. It is a characteristic thing that the decision to remove him from the Political Bureau was never discussed but was reached in a devious fashion. In the same way came the decision concerning the removal of Kuznetsov and Rodionov from their posts.

The importance of the Central Committee's Political Bureau was reduced and its work was disorganized by the creation within the Political Bureau of various commissions—the so-called quintets, sextets, septets, and novenaries. Here is, for instance, a resolution of the Political Bureau of October 3, 1946:

"Stalin's proposal:

"1. The Political Bureau Commission for Foreign Affairs (sextet) is to concern itself in the future, in addition to foreign affairs, also with matters of internal construction and domestic policy.

"2. The Sextet is to add to its roster the chairman of the State Commission of Economic Planning of the U. S. S. R., Comrade Voznesensky, and is to be known as a Septet."

"Signed: Secretary of the Central Committee, J. Stalin."

What a terminology of a card player. [Laughter in the hall.] It is clear that the creation within the Political Bureau of this type of commissions—quintets, sextets, septets, and novenaries—was against the principle of collective leadership. The result of this was that some members of the Political Bureau were in this way kept away from participation in reaching the most important State matters.

One of the oldest members of our party, Kliment Yefremovich Voroshilov, found himself in an almost impossible situation. For several years he was actually deprived of the right of participation in Political Bureau sessions. Stalin forbade him to attend the Political Bureau sessions and to receive documents. When the Political Bureau was in session and Comrade Voroshilov heard about it, he telephoned each time and asked whether he would be allowed to attend. Sometimes Stalin permitted it, but always showed his dissatisfaction. Because of his extreme suspicion, Stalin toyed also with the absurd and ridiculous suspicion that Voroshilov was an English agent. [Laughter in the hall.] It's true—an English agent. A special tapping device was installed in his home to listen to what was said there. [Indignation in the hall.]

By unilateral decision Stalin had also separated one other man from the work of the political bureau—Andrey Andreyevich Andreyev. This was one of the most unbridled acts of willfulness.

Let us consider the first Central Committee plenum after the 19th party congress when Stalin, in his talk at the plenum, characterized Vyacheslav Mikhailovich Molotov and Anastas Ivanovich Mikoyan and suggested that these old workers of our party were guilty of some baseless charges. It is not excluded that had Stalin remained at the helm for another several months, Comrades Molotov and Mikoyan would probably have not delivered any speeches at this congress.

Stalin evidently had plans to finish off the old members of the political bureau. He often stated that political bureau members should be replaced by new ones.

His proposal, after the 19th congress concerning the selection of 25 persons to the Central Committee presidium, was aimed at

the removal of the old political bureau members and the bringing in of less experienced persons so that these would extol him in all sorts of ways.

We can assume that this was also a design for the future annihilation of the old political bureau members and in this way a cover for all shameful acts of Stalin, acts which we are now considering.

Comrades, in order not to repeat errors of the past, the central committee has declared itself resolutely against the cult of the individual. We consider that Stalin was excessively extolled. However, in the past Stalin doubtlessly performed great services to the party, to the working class, and to the international workers' movement.

This question is complicated by the fact that all this which we have just discussed was done during Stalin's life under his leadership and with his concurrence; here Stalin was convinced that this was necessary for the defense of the interests of the working classes against the plotting of the enemies and against the attack of the imperialist camp. He saw this from the position of the interest of the working class, of the interest of the laboring people, of the interest of the victory of socialism and communism. We cannot say that these were the deeds of a giddy despot. He considered that this should be done in the interest of the party; of the working masses, in the name of the defense of the revolution's gains. In this lies the whole tragedy.

Comrades, Lenin had often stressed that modesty is an absolutely integral part of a real Bolshevik. Lenin himself was the living personification of the greatest modesty. We cannot say that we have been following this Leninist example in all respects. It is enough to point out that many towns, factories, and industrial enterprises, Kolkhozes and Sovkhozes, Soviet institutions and cultural institutions have been referred to by us with a title—if I may express it so—of private property of the names of these or those government or party leaders who were still active and in good health. Many of us participated in the action of assigning our names to various towns, rayons, undertakings, and Kolkhozes. We must correct this. [Applause.]

But this should be done calmly and slowly. The central committee will discuss this matter and consider it carefully in order to prevent errors and excesses. I can remember how the Ukraine learned about Kossior's arrest. The Kiev radio used to start its programs thus: "This is radio (in the name of) Kossior." When one day the programs began without naming Kossior, everyone was quite certain that something had happened to Kossior, that he probably had been arrested.

Thus, if today we begin to remove the signs everywhere and to change names, people will think that these comrades in whose honor the given enterprises, Kolkhozes or cities are named, also met some bad fate and that they have also been arrested. [Animation in the hall.]

How is the authority and the importance of this or that leader judged? On the basis of how many towns, industrial enterprises, and factories, Kolkhozes and Sovkhozes carry his name. Is it not about time that we eliminate this private property and nationalize the factories, the industrial enterprises, the Kolkhozes, and the Sovkhozes? [Laughter, applause, voices: "That is right."] This will benefit our cause. After all, the cult of the individual is manifested, also, in this way.

We should in all seriousness consider the question of the cult of the individual. We cannot let this matter get out of the party, especially not to the press. It is for this reason that we are considering it here at a closed congress session. We should know the limits; we should not give ammunition to the enemy; we should not wash our dirty linen before their eyes. I think that the delegates to the congress will understand and assess properly all these proposals. [Tumultuous applause.]

Comrades, we must abolish the cult of the individual decisively, once and for all; we must draw the proper conclusions concerning both ideological-theoretical and practical work.

It is necessary for this purpose:

First, in a Bolshevik manner to condemn and to eradicate the cult of the individual as alien to Marxism-Leninism and not consonant with the principles of party leadership and the norms of party life, and to fight inexorably all attempts at bringing back this practice in one form or another.

To return to and actually practice in all our ideological work, the most important theses of Marxist-Leninist science about the people as the creator of history and as the creator of all material and spiritual good of humanity, about the decisive role of the Marxist party in the revolutionary fight for the transformation of society, about the victory of communism.

In this connection we will be forced to do much work in order to examine critically from the Marxist-Leninist viewpoint and to correct the widely spread erroneous views connected with the cult of the individual in the sphere of history, philosophy, economy, and of other sciences, as well as in the literature and the fine arts. It is especially necessary that in the immediate future we compile a serious textbook of the history of our party which will be edited in accordance with scientific Marxist objectivism, a textbook of the history of Soviet society, a book pertaining to the events of the civil war and the great patriotic war.

Secondly, to continue systematically and consistently the work done by the party's central committee during the last years, a work characterized by minute observation in all party organizations, from the bottom to the top, of the Leninist principles of party leadership, characterized, above all, by the main principle of collective leadership, characterized by the observation of the norms of party life described in the statutes of our party, and, finally, characterized by the wide practice of criticism and self-criticism.

Thirdly, to restore completely the Leninist principles of Soviet Socialist democracy, expressed in the constitution of the Soviet Union, to fight willfulness of individuals abusing their power. The evil caused by acts violating revolutionary Socialist legality which have accumulated during a long time as a result of the negative influence of the cult of the individual has to be completely corrected.

Comrades, the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has manifested with a new strength the unshakable unity of our party, its cohesiveness around the central committee, its resolute will to accomplish the great task of building communism. [Tumultuous applause.] And the fact that we present in all their ramifications the basic problems of overcoming the cult of the individual which is alien to Marxism-Leninism, as well as the problem of liquidating its burdensome consequences, is an evidence of the great moral and political strength of our party. [Prolonged applause.]

We are absolutely certain that our party, armed with the historical resolutions of the 20th Congress, will lead the Soviet people along the Leninist path to new successes, to new victories. [Tumultuous, prolonged applause.]

Long live the victorious banner of our party—Leninism. [Tumultuous, prolonged applause ending in ovation. All rise.]

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 4, 1956]

KHRUSHCHEV'S SPEECH

(By Roscoe Drummond)

UNREPORTED PARTS ARE ENLIGHTENING

More information concerning Nikita Khrushchev's famous 6-hour indictment of

Stalin and the "cult of the individual" before the 20th Congress of the Communist Party is significantly coming to light.

This information, which will certainly be in the public domain before long, makes it clear that there were aspects of the anti-Stalin speech which were intended only for loyal Communist ears and which were not reported in the lengthy digests which the Soviet leaders carefully circulated via Pravda.

Already some heretofore unreported parts of Khrushchev's address have appeared in Paris and I would expect that one western government or another would momentarily lay its hands on the full unexpurgated version and make it known.

It would be a public service to bring out all the facts so that we can know more about what is going on inside Russia without the no-trespassing limits of the Soviet censorship.

Embassy diplomatic sources here are already aware in considerable detail of the unpublished sections of the Khrushchev speech and those who have access to this information agree that the full text makes several things more badly evident than what came out 3 months ago.

What emerges with new clarity is:

That, however much Khrushchev berated the "excesses" of Stalin's repressions he did not at any point in his speech berate repression.

That while the "collective" leaders of the Soviet regime spoke harshly of the "cult of individual" dictatorship, they did not speak harshly at all of dictatorship.

That Khrushchev specifically emphasized—and brought it home several times—that Lenin himself used the most severe measures against "enemies" of the revolution.

That Stalin's greatest offense was not that he used methods of brutality but that he used them when it wasn't really necessary and against the wrong people.

When the text of this historic speech becomes available, whether through a satellite or elsewhere, there is no doubt that it will show that Khrushchev actually praised Lenin for using repression when, as he would put it, it was actually necessary.

Thus the Khrushchev indictment of Stalin centers on the criticism that Stalin purged Communists who disagreed with him as well as all others who disagreed with him.

There now seems no doubt that the Khrushchev speech has given greater significance than it appeared to have in its first sensational disclosure. Despite the exhaustive official accounts which have been allowed to appear in Moscow, Belgrade and elsewhere, it is clear that the Kremlin has acted to keep much of it secret from the outside world and has deleted important parts of it from what the Russian people themselves have been allowed to know.

Apparently it is in line with this formula—that is, muting the excesses of repression but retaining the capacity to impose more repression at any time—that recent reforms in the Soviet system have been carried out. "Forced labor" camps are supposed to be abolished in the next 18 months. Mass purges are described as ended. Persecution and prosecution without evidence and without trial—or trial based on pressured confessions have been officially condemned.

But the totalitarian Soviet state still keeps at its disposal innumerable means of enforcement and punishment, including liquidation. The Khrushchev speech shows that the Kremlin has no intention of abandoning severe means or hesitating to resort to them.

Perhaps the most revealing aspects of the recently proclaimed reforms is that these new restraints against repression were decreed from above without any participation of the Russian people—exactly as were excessive repressions themselves.

What the full Khrushchev text will make clear is that while the "rude" Stalin has been laid to rest, all the organs of rude coercion are retained in the hands of the Kremlin for use whenever necessary.

CONGRESSIONAL INTENT IN EXTENDING BENEFITS OF SPECIAL SCHOOL-MILK PROGRAM TO CERTAIN CHILD-CARE INSTITUTIONS AND SUMMER CAMPS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement relative to the extension of the benefits of the special school-milk program to certain child-care institutions and summer camps. I submit this statement in the hope that it will clear up the purpose of that particular piece of legislation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There appears to be some misunderstanding concerning the intent of the action taken by Congress in extending the benefits of the special school-milk program to certain child-care institutions and summer camps. This extension was authorized in Public Law 465, approved April 2, 1956, which provided for the continuation of the school-milk program through June 30, 1958.

The action to include certain child-care centers in this overall program originated with the Senate Agriculture Committee in an amendment to the bill which had originated in the House. The members of the committee gave full consideration to the intended scope of this expansion of the program. It was the prevailing desire of the committee to direct this extension of the milk program to summer camps and to settlement houses, orphanages, and other similar institutions which were serving economically underprivileged children. The aim was to reach the school-age children who are least likely to be getting adequate amounts of milk during the summer months when schools are closed. In addition, by including nursery schools, child-care centers and orphanages, assistance could be provided in increasing milk consumption among underprivileged children of preschool age.

It was with this objective in mind that language was added to the bill which became Public Law 465 to provide that the eligible summer camps and child-care institutions must be "devoted to the care and training of underprivileged children on a public welfare or charitable basis." This was done in the belief that such camps and institutions for economically underprivileged children offered the best opportunity for increasing the consumption of surplus milk. It was recognized that the language used would exclude many fine organizations and summer camps, such as Boy Scout and 4-H camps, which are doing splendid work in providing recreational and other activities for all of our boys and girls. However, in view of the basic purpose of the special school-milk program, it was felt that Federal subsidies to such organizations should not be provided under a program which is essentially a price-support activity.

RETIREMENT OF GEN. ANTHONY C. McAULIFFE

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, last Thursday afternoon, May 31, 1956, at historic old Fort Myer, the United States Army honored the retirement of Gen. Anthony C. McAuliffe, retiring commander in chief, United

States Army in Europe. The occasion brought to a brilliant conclusion the distinguished military career of a great American soldier, following 38 years of service.

Cohosts for the occasion were the distinguished Secretary of the Army, Wilber M. Brucker, and the superior soldier, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Army Chief of Staff.

Occupying the reviewing stand during the ceremony were Mr. Brucker, General Taylor, Maj. Gen. John G. Van Houten, commanding general of the Military District of Washington, and General McAuliffe.

In honor of the retirement of this outstanding American and brilliant soldier, a 17-gun salute was fired, and the 3d "Old Guard" Infantry Regiment passed in review. That historic outfit never appeared to better advantage. With flying colors, glistening bayonets, and perfect marching, it was an inspiration to view this representation of our glorious ground troops who have so greatly distinguished themselves in combat in all parts of the world.

America is extremely proud of General McAuliffe and his unwavering loyalty to his country. His unsurpassed leadership should inspire every American to stand up for the ideals of our country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as part of my remarks a brief biography of General McAuliffe, and also two citations issued in connection with his retirement.

There being no objection, the biography and citations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHY

Gen. Anthony C. McAuliffe was born in Washington, D. C., in 1898 and was graduated from the United States Military Academy in 1918, when he was commissioned as second lieutenant of field artillery.

After an inspection of European battlefields, in 1919 General McAuliffe's career followed the normal peacetime pattern of a field artillery officer. During the 1920's and 1930's he held routine staff and line assignments in the United States and Hawaii.

From 1939 to 1942, General McAuliffe held important War Department general staff assignments with the Services of Supply. In August 1942 he was promoted to brigadier general and assigned to the 101st (Screaming Eagles) Airborne Division as artillery commander.

On the night of June 5-6, 1944, General McAuliffe parachuted into France with the 101st. Later, succeeding General Pratt (who was killed on D-Day) as deputy commander of that famous division, General McAuliffe led a task force which captured the junction city of Carentan.

During the desperate Battle of the Bulge, in December 1944, General McAuliffe was acting commander of the 101st when the Screaming Eagles made their epic stand at Bastogne.

In January 1945, General McAuliffe was promoted to major general and assumed command of the 103d Infantry Division which broke through the Siegfried line, raced through Germany and Austria, captured Innsbruck and the Brenner Pass and linked up with the American Fifth Army troops from Italy.

Subsequent to World War II, General McAuliffe has held some of the Army's most important staff assignments, having served as Assistant Chief of Staff for Personnel, Chief of the Army Chemical Corps, and Deputy

Chief of Staff for Operations and Administration.

Since World War II, the general has commanded the Airborne Center at Camp MacKall, N. C., the 24th Infantry Division in Japan, and the Seventh Army in Germany. General McAuliffe's final assignment was as commander-in-chief of the United States Army in Europe.

Among his American decorations, General McAuliffe earned the Distinguished Service Cross; the Distinguished Service Medal; the Silver Star; the Legion of Merit; the Bronze Star Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, and two Presidential citations. His foreign decorations include the British Distinguished Order with Bar, the French Legion of Honor, the Croix de Guerre; the Belgian Order of Leopold, Croix de Guerre, and Fourragere; and the Dutch Orders of William and of the Golden Lion.

ANTHONY CLEMENT McAULIFFE, GENERAL, UNITED STATES ARMY, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, UNITED STATES ARMY, EUROPE, MAY 31, 1956

Mindful of your long and distinguished service to the Army and to our country, we take great pleasure in subscribing this testimonial attesting to the high regard in which you are held by your associates.

Your illustrious career, embracing two world wars and the Korean conflict, has been characterized by your unswerving devotion to duty and high principled integrity. During World War II, the aggressive leadership you displayed as artillery commander and then as deputy commander of the 101st Airborne Division, contributed to the development of airborne warfare. When that division was besieged at Bastogne, your courageous leadership in the conduct of the defense electrified the entire Allied world. Later, the vigor and resourcefulness with which you led the 103d Infantry Division in the attack upon the Siegfried Line, and on into Germany and Austria added to the victory of American arms.

After the war the administrative ability you demonstrated as Chief of the Chemical Corps was instrumental in revitalizing that branch to enable it better to meet the demands of modern war. As Assistant Chief of Staff, G-1, of the Army during the Korean conflict, you played an important part in maintaining the morale and efficiency of our forces and thereby assisted greatly in coping with the emergency. Finally, as Commander in Chief of the United States Army in Europe, your efforts further developed the deterrent strength of American arms.

The entire Army joins in wishing for you, in your retirement, continued success and richly deserved happiness.

The President of the United States of America, authorized by act of Congress, July 9, 1918, has awarded the Distinguished Service Medal, First Oak Leaf Cluster, to Gen. Anthony C. McAuliffe, United States Army, for exceptionally meritorious service in a duty of great responsibility.

As commanding general, Seventh Army, and later as commander in chief, United States Army, Europe, from October 20, 1953, to April 30, 1956, General McAuliffe distinguished himself by exceptionally meritorious service in a position of great trust and responsibility. Under his brilliant and aggressive direction, his diversified forces achieved and maintained a peak level of fighting readiness. General McAuliffe effectively developed new combat techniques to meet the demands of the constantly changing international situation. His wide experience and understanding of diplomatic and political implications were of paramount importance in planning and directing the activities of this vital command. His superb leadership and outstanding professional skill were a source of inspiration to all with whom he

associated. General McAuliffe's unwavering loyalty and integrity and unsurpassed standing among soldiers reflect the utmost credit upon himself and the military service.

ISRAEL AND THE NEAR EAST

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, just about a year ago, on June 1, 1955, I took the floor of the Senate to express my misgivings about our Near East policy. At that time the Mutual Security Act was pending before the Senate, and I questioned the wisdom of arms shipment to Iraq, in view of the continued refusal of Iraq and her sister Arab states to make peace with Israel.

I said at that time:

I am afraid that this program endangers Israel. It may lead to a costly arms race. It may make it far more difficult to secure peace there. It may play into the hands of the Kremlin.

I said in the same speech:

The Israelis must be bewildered by our policy. They are a democratic people. They are ready to stand with the West. Here we are arming their enemies but refusing arms to them. More than that, we are actively promoting a system of alliance in the area, and Israel is excluded from membership.

I called attention to the fact that Israel is barred from joining the Turkish-Iraq Pact because Iraq does not recognize Israel.

I said:

Moreover, while we have an arms agreement with Iraq, the British are supplying arms to Jordan, Israel's eastern neighbor. The Egyptians have the means to buy large amounts of military equipment. To the Israelis the situation is fraught with peril, for Israel is isolated and alone; and if it were attacked tomorrow, no one would be obligated to come to its assistance.

This is a most unhealthy situation, and it does not make for a peaceful settlement because the vulnerability of the Israelis must be a source of tempting encouragement to the Arabs.

In the months that have passed, the situation in the Near East has gravely deteriorated and the misgivings which I expressed a year ago are deepened by events.

The Kremlin is now in the Near East. Egypt has acquired large amounts of military equipment from Communist Czechoslovakia, and now has air superiority over Israel. Egypt has organized a coalition of antiwestern states which resist our efforts to strengthen the region against the threat of Communist subversion and aggression.

I am convinced that we continue to blunder in the Near East. I object strenuously to the military shipments we have been making to the area, just as I fear the military shipments the Communists have been making. I intend to do everything in my power to change this policy.

Recently, despite the fact that our Government refused to sell arms to Israel, it was disclosed that we plan to continue to give arms to Iraq under the new mutual security program which calls for an increase of \$367 million military aid to the Near East. I believe that it is morally wrong and inconsistent with the best interests of the United States for us to continue this kind of one-sided

policy. In my judgment, our policies are playing directly into the hands of Russia and the Middle East.

The Arab States are determined to destroy Israel. Under the armistice of February 24, 1949, signed by Egypt and Israel, each side pledged that no aggressive action shall be undertaken, planned or threatened against the people of the other. They agreed that the right of each party to its security and freedom from fear of attacks by the armed forces of the other shall be fully respected. They promised that the armistice would be considered as an instrument to facilitate the transition from the present truce to permanent peace in Palestine.

During the same year, 1949, similar agreements were reached by Israel with Jordan, Lebanon and Syria. All of these formal armistice agreements were arranged under the auspices of the United Nations. I recall that the Jordan settlement provided for a special committee to expedite the reopening of the cultural and humanitarian institutions on Mt. Scopus, meaning the Hebrew University and the Hadassah Hospital. They were still closed.

Instead of carrying out the terms of this armistice, the Arab States have consistently threatened the absolute destruction of Israel. It has become a common-place of Egyptian politics for its leaders to launch tirades against Israel at the drop of a fez.

Some folks may play down the killings which have taken place as border incidents. I regard them as acts of war. From July 1949 to October 1955, 1,039 Israeli men, women, and children were killed along the frontier. In addition, a total of 2,231 armed attacks by Arabs upon Israelis took place. These things could not be ignored by any self-respecting nation. If our American borders were violated in any such way, we would have sent a full-size army to meet such a challenge.

I have said that our present policy plays into the hands of world communism. The Russians have everything to gain and nothing to lose by dealing with the Arab states. They would like to make Egypt a Russian Mediterranean base. Wars between nations are the Communists' meat. Whatever happens, no matter who wins or loses, communism is always waiting to claim the spoils. A war between Egypt and Israel would be the greatest calamity in the history of the Near East. We cannot permit it. I am certain that we will not permit it.

American foreign policy in the Near East, as everywhere else, is based upon our national interests. Admittedly, the oil reserves of Iraq and Iran are important. They are useless to us if war breaks out. From the purely selfish viewpoint of American self-interest, therefore, we must prevent war.

But I refuse to believe that oil must be the predominant factor in the development of an American foreign policy. Humanity is more important than oil. In this difficult period of world history, mankind is in need of spiritual regeneration. We have gone through an era of the most shocking barbarism in the records of humanity. One of the few

decent reactions to the cruelty of World War II has been the establishment of the Republic of Israel. Nazi hostility will never be forgotten by civilized men. We cannot permit a new outbreak of savagery to follow in its wake. If American foreign policy permits such an event—or if it contributes to such a catastrophe—that foreign policy is wrong.

I do not know the answers to many of the issues raised in this most difficult field of international tension. But I do know this—that we cannot sit by while it goes from bad to worse.

Some positive steps are essential at once.

First, we must see to it that the balance of military power is not disturbed in the Near East by any one. I do not believe in an arms race, but I do not believe that we can allow Egypt to arm for aggression while Israel sits in the waiting room. We must make arms available to Israel.

Secondly, we must guarantee the borders of Israel, and see to it that they are not violated. If they are violated, we must call the violators before the bar of world justice.

Raiders, thieves, saboteurs and murderers must pay for their crimes, whether they be individuals or nations.

Thirdly, we must use our good offices to achieve a settlement of the Arab refugee problem.

This is by no means a simple matter. I know that the Arab States are large enough to absorb the estimated 800,000 Arab refugees. I know, too, that most of these refugees left their homes because they were urged to do so by Arab leaders. They were told in 1948 that the Arab forces would wipe out the Jewish armies in a few days, and they would return quickly. These are facts, but their recognition does not solve the problem.

The United Nations has set up a fund of \$200 million to resettle the Arab refugees, but the Arab States have refused to act. They would rather use the difficulties of the Arab refugees as a political weapon than treat the problem on a humanitarian level. I am certain that the Arab States with almost 3 million square miles of land can absorb 800,000 people. If little Israel, with 8,000 square miles all told can build a homeland for one and a half million people, there can be no economic justification for the Arab position.

I believe that a firm stand must be taken to resolve this refugee problem. If we insist upon action, I believe that we can get it.

My fourth proposal is this: International supervision and patrol of the Gaza strip by the United Nations should be substituted for the present friction producing system. This area has been the most sensitive and difficult spot on the Israeli map. It can be eliminated.

There is a fifth important item on my list. Our country is a party to pacts with 44 European and Asiatic nations. Each of these agreements is part of the program of collective security. We are parties also to the Tripartite Declaration of 1950. In this agreement, our Nation, Great Britain, and France jointly pledged their efforts to prevent aggression and to preserve the military balance in the Near East.

This balance is clearly in danger of being destroyed. I believe that our Government should negotiate a security treaty with Israel and with all those Arab States which are prepared to take steps for the establishment of lasting peace in the Near East.

These are affirmative steps. I believe that they represent not only an effective approach to the problems of Israel and the Near East, but also to the basic interests of the United States. All of us, no matter what may be our political affiliations, realize today that the great threat to world peace comes from Communist aggression and Communist subversion. The Soviet Union courts friends for one purpose only, to weaken them through propaganda, and, subsequently, to engulf them. Today they are playing the field. The sale of armaments by Communist Czechoslovakia to Egypt is the first step in the invasion of Egypt by Soviet technicians, agents, and propagandists.

A similar proposal to sell arms to Afghanistan is already under way. We cannot sit idly by while the Soviet Union outflanks the Western World in the whole Mediterranean and Near East theater.

Israel is an important key to the unfolding drama of Asia Minor. For centuries in the ancient past, the land of the Bible linked Asia and Africa. In the critical world situation of the present day, the same importance may be attached to Israel once more.

It is only 8 years since Israel came into being. There is no doubt that wonders have been accomplished in this period. In this brief moment of history, three-quarters of a million people have swarmed into Israel. They have doubled the population. This is the most amazing refutation of modern immigration theories ever recorded. Only a few years ago, the British were saying that the "economic absorptivity" of a much larger Palestine could not handle any more immigrants. I know the situation which has resulted. The people of Israel are poor in material wealth. They do not enjoy the comforts of America. But they are living in freedom and glorying in their self-reliance.

All of us in this Chamber believe in God. We feel instinctively that God will protect this new nation in the future as He has protected its people in the past. There is a famous Lincoln story concerning a delegation of clergymen who visited President Lincoln during the Civil War. They discussed the moral problems involved in the fighting, and as they turned to leave, one minister said to the President: "Mr. Lincoln, I pray that the Lord will be on our side in this struggle." Abraham Lincoln looked at him and replied: "I pray that we may be on the Lord's side."

The issue, as I see it, is more than a diplomatic struggle. In Israel, our country has helped to create a new outpost of the Free World. It is threatened by hostile forces.

One group wishes to destroy its entire physical being, wipe out its people, and level this new nation to the ground. A second equally sinister group wishes to

use Israel as a pawn in the Communist game. Neither of these attacks will succeed.

We as Americans have a great stake in this area. As human beings, we have no less a stake in the issues involved in the Near East. The Jewish community and the Arabs, too, sometimes forget the deep sentiments associated by the western Christian tradition with the land of the Bible. All of us abhor the thought of war and bloodshed on the soil we call the Holy Land.

These are, perhaps, unrealistic considerations. I regard them as important in determining the development of world opinion. From every viewpoint, practical, religious, sentimental, the American people must establish and preserve lasting peace in the Middle East.

In the past few days, the Foreign Minister of Israel has taken strong exception to the recent testimony of our Secretary of State before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Mr. Dulles said that "a nation's security does not rest on arms alone." This is true. Israel's fight for freedom in 1948 proved that more than weapons are required to win a battle. But you must certainly have the weapons, too. I shall do everything that I can to persuade our country to provide the necessary weapons.

I applaud David Ben Gurion's pledge to refrain from launching a preventive war. I hope that Israel will not apply to the Soviet Union for military aid.

We can understand the determination of Israel to preserve its existence by every possible means. If we do not help her, she must seek help elsewhere. But it seems to me we must help her. We are the leaders of the free world. We are dedicated to the defense of freedom and democracy wherever it may be menaced or endangered. Israel is a young and vibrant democracy and her survival is menaced by Communist weapons. She has a right to appeal to us for aid, and surely we have an obligation to respond to that appeal.

I want our Government to announce that the preservation of the State of Israel is a basic element of our policy in the Middle East. But I want more than words. I want decisive action, for when the Arab world realizes that we mean business, we may look for some kind of peaceful settlement.

I have heard it said within recent weeks that our Government now recognizes that Israel is in danger, that Egypt does have superiority in the air, and that therefore Israel really does have a legitimate need for planes and weapons to protect her cities and villages and to deter aggression. But it is reported that while we recognize that need, the Department of State would prefer to have other nations such as France and Canada supply Israel with the planes she must have. I cannot understand this indirect method of responding to the appeal of a sister democracy in peril. I cannot see any moral justification for urging other governments to do what we ourselves are not ready to do. This is not leadership.

Perhaps there are some who believe that we must remain aloof lest we might incur Arab displeasure or lose Arab oil

or forfeit our potential role as the final peacemaker. I submit that this is not the road to peace.

Peace will never be secured by appeasing aggression. The way to bring the Arab States to the peace table once and for all is to make it clear that we will not permit them to dictate our Near East policy. I hope that Mr. Dulles will not persist in the course of indirection. It is not a proud or courageous policy. It does not reflect credit on the integrity or leadership of America.

These are difficult and uncertain days for all the world. In times of tension and tragedy, it is good to remember that God rules this world, not by might, not by force, but by His word. The still, small voice of man's conscience often goes unheard in the tempest, but when the wind subsides it is still speaking.

I pray, with my colleagues, for peace everywhere; but come what may, America must be on the side of decency and justice and humanity everywhere. In the Middle East, there is no doubt where these claims rest.

Decency, justice, and humanity place America squarely at the side of Israel. We must remain there.

THE TRUTH ABOUT PALESTINE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Saturday, June 2, the New York Times carried a very interesting and illuminating editorial entitled "The Truth About Palestine." This editorial pointed out the intransigent attitude that has been assumed by the Arab countries regarding the efforts of the United Nations to bring peace into the sorely troubled areas of the Middle East. As a result, consideration of the British resolution that expressed hope for lasting peace in the Middle East has been delayed. I quote only one sentence of the editorial from the Times:

The delay that kept the Council working overtime was due mainly to the reluctance of the Arab States—Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, and Egypt—to admit that the State of Israel legally exists and to give up, for good and all, their ambition to drive the Israelis into the Mediterranean.

With that kind of cruel and unrealistic attitude on the part of the Arab countries, how can we hope that lasting peace will be achieved in the Middle East? Peace will not come as long as there is on one side blind hate and a will to kill and to destroy. Peace must be based upon security and respect for the legitimate hopes and ideals of a noble little democratic nation.

This editorial is so important that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks. I hope that it will be carefully read and studied by Members of the Congress and by the American people, generally.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRUTH ABOUT PALESTINE

The United Nations Security Council has been spending some tedious hours this week wrestling with the wording of a British resolution that expressed hope for a lasting peace in Palestine. The delay that kept the

council working overtime was due mainly to the reluctance of the Arab states—Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, and Egypt—to admit that the State of Israel legally exists and to give up, for good and all, their ambition to drive the Israelis into the Mediterranean. For this reason the discussion yesterday, still incomplete, was postponed until Monday afternoon.

Not one Arab speaker said one word to indicate that he felt the awful responsibility of restoring or maintaining peace in the Near East; not one showed the slightest understanding, or desire to understand, the urge that drove so many abused and harassed individuals into the ancient land of Palestine, to set up a new commonwealth and labor for a new hope; not one welcomed the kind of peace that might result from accepting Israel as a neighbor; each, without exception, seemed to be waiting for the ultimate catastrophe that by wrecking the Mediterranean world, and perhaps all the Western World might destroy the tiny State of Israel.

These assertions are not rhetorical. The fault the Arabs found with the original British resolution was that it used words suggesting, however vaguely, that a peaceful and permanent settlement of the trouble between Israel and her Arab neighbors might be reached. The Arab spokesmen wouldn't have this. They regarded it as an offense for the United Nations to endorse, or the Secretary General to attempt, any solution that might put an end to the suffering and suspense in the Near East and open the way to peace and prosperity for all. They stuck to medieval notions that are now as out of date as chain armor, spears, and battleaxes.

Listen to the Syrian spokesman, Ambassador Ahmed Shukairy, speaking Thursday afternoon. He referred to Palestine, that is, the State of Israel, recognized by our own and most other Governments, received in 1949 as a member of the United Nations, as "part and parcel of the Arab homeland." He went on to say:

"To advocate the idea of a mutually acceptable solution must inevitably lead to a reversal of all the resolutions of the United Nations. . . . We must begin from the beginning. We must start de novo on a clean sheet. Everything written by the United Nations should be written off, ever since November 29, 1947. (This was the date of the U. N. partition resolution.) The establishment of Israel, its membership in the United Nations and all other resolutions will have to be revoked. Then, and then only, the United Nations can look forward to a solution 'on a mutually acceptable basis.'"

We have to put this remarkable utterance into the context of a debate over Mr. Hammarskjöld's patient and impartial efforts to stop the killing in the Near East. Mr. Hammarskjöld reported, as in duty bound. He had kept—so it seemed to most observers—within the limits of the April 4 resolution, under which he had gone to Palestine. He had received assurances from all the parties, the four Arab States necessarily included, that they would try to reduce border squabbles and accept an increased and improved measure of U. N. supervision. There is every indication that the Arab States and Israel gave the assurances in good faith. But if we judge by the Arab arguments in the Security Council this week this good faith was in the Arab case of a temporary nature. Given an opportunity, one had to conclude, the Arabs would pounce on Israel.

Neither side in the Near Eastern troubles has been without blame. Each side has unnecessarily taken innocent lives. But the Israelis are now willing to settle and end the bloodshed. The Arabs, if their spokesmen truly represented them this week, are not ready to do this finally and for all time.

PARTICIPATION BY ALASKA IN FEDERAL ROAD-BUILDING PROGRAM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the simple justice of Senate action last week to include the Territory of Alaska in the Federal Highway Act of 1956 has brought a favorable response from a number of major newspapers. This editorial support for our Senate amendment, bringing Alaska into the Federal road-building program, indicates a degree of public interest in improving the economic development of the Territory.

If the Senate amendment is retained in the Highway Act, Alaskans will share with residents of other Territories and the 48 States these benefits of long-range highway planning. The bill would bring an end to the on-again-off-again system which has made the Alaska road-building program an unknown quantity.

It is my hope that the House and Senate conferees will agree with the wisdom of providing Alaska with equality in Federal highway matters. I also hope that the editorial comments regarding the Alaska highway amendment come to the attention of the conference committee, so that its members may be apprised of the endorsements for this proposal. Mr. President, I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD excellent editorials from the Washington Evening Star of June 1, 1956; the Washington News of June 2, 1956; and the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 2, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 1, 1956]

COMPROMISE ON ALASKA

The Senate has sent into conference on the highway bill a proposal for ending a questionable discrimination against Alaska. Sponsored by Senator NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, it would entitle Alaska to receive a share of the new Federal road building aid. The highway bill as passed in the House excludes Alaska from this benefit—as has been the case since the first Federal aid highway bill was enacted in 1916. At the same time, the current legislation makes the new highway-user taxes—by which the program is to be financed—applicable in Alaska. Acknowledging that Alaska's great area and the large amount of public domain in the Territory made it a special problem, the Oregon Senator won approval for his amendment by proposing that only one-third of the area should be figured in the apportionment formula. The effect of this modification would be to keep the Alaskan grant within reasonable limitation. The compromise is worthy of serious consideration by the conferees on the bill.

[From the Washington News of June 2, 1956]

ROADS FOR ALASKA

The Senate's action dealing Alaska in on the new highway measure was a commendable recognition of that Territory's special road problems. The Senators who voted the amendment also seemed impressed with the argument that without it Alaskans would have to pay extra taxes to build new roads in the States, yet have no assurance of benefits for their own area.

Alaska has been getting Federal aid for highways, but only in the budget of the Interior Department. That agency's policy on roads for Alaska has been whimsical, to put it

charitably, and if Alaskans had to depend on it in the future they still would have no idea from one year to the next what to expect.

Highways are especially important to a developing region, and Alaska's rapid economic development is in turn of special concern to the Nation.

The method approved by the Senate is the best means of assuring Alaska of the road aid it needs and should have during the next few years. We hope it will meet the approval of the conferees representing the House as well.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 2, 1956]

HIGHWAYS FOR ALASKA

The Senate remedied a long-time injustice by including Alaska in the new Federal highway aid bill. An amendment sponsored by Senator NEUBERGER was accepted after the basis for allocation of funds, initially figured on one-half of Alaska's area, was changed to one-third. This will bring Alaska approximately \$11,500,000 in Federal road funds in fiscal 1958 in a program looking toward the expenditure of some \$15,500,000 in 1959. Alaskans will also pay a greater share of their road costs; the Federal formula calls for a larger territorial expenditure than the previous voluntary contributions made to the Alaska Road Commission of the Department of the Interior.

A principal advantage of the new basis, if it is approved by the House, will be continuity. It is shocking to realize that because of the on-again-off-again nature of roadbuilding efforts through Interior, this vast northern Territory today has only 3,700 miles of highways, only 800 of them paved. The State of Delaware, with only one-two hundred and eighty-fifth the area, has more miles of road; and Nevada, which has a population comparable to that of Alaska, has nearly eight times as many miles of highways. Neglect, rather than the difficult of building roads in this ward of the Federal Government, has held back Alaska's development.

The compromise will not get Alaska substantially more funds immediately, for the 1957 Department of the Interior construction and maintenance figure is \$11,425,000. Thus it is essential not to reduce the area formula below one-third lest it turn out to be a blow instead of a boon; 40 percent would be fairer. But the most important thing is the principle of including Alaska along with Hawaii and Puerto Rico. If House conferees will accept the amendment Alaska can feel that it has joined the Union in one respect, even though it is still denied statehood.

PANAMA CANAL IMPROVEMENTS: VIEWS OF EXPERIENCED ENGINEERS

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, over a period of years I have devoted much time and effort to interoceanic canal problems and have made many statements thereon. Most of these are listed in the comprehensive documentation about Isthmian Canal Policy of the United States prepared by Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas, and published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 23, 1955.

In the course of my studies, I have received numerous illuminating communications from eminent engineers and others with Panama Canal experience. Some of these expressions, because of the grave importance of the canal subject and high stature of their authors, should be of great interest not only to the Congress and officials of the Executive Department, but also to the Nation,

especially agencies that use the canal or are otherwise affected by transit tolls.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD A Memorandum to the Members of the Congress on the Panama Canal Problem, and pertinent excerpts from a number of letters from experienced engineers.

There being no objection, the indicated memorandum and excerpts were ordered to be printed as follows:

THE PANAMA CANAL PROBLEM—A MEMORANDUM TO THE MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS

Honorable Members of the Congress of the United States:

The undersigned, who in various capacities participated in the construction of the Panama Canal, venture to bring to your attention the matters hereinafter discussed:

1. The necessity for increased capacity and operational improvement of the Panama Canal—a much-neglected waterway, now approaching obsolescence—has long been recognized. The traffic volume is the highest since 1914. With the saturation point approaching, it is essential to provide, without further delay, the additional transit capacity and operational improvements required to meet future needs.

2. The two major proposals for increased facilities are:

(a) Improvement of the existing canal by completing the authorized Third Locks Project, adapted to include the features of the well-conceived Terminal Lake Plan (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 21, 1948, p. A2449—approved in principle by the Governor of the Panama Canal in hearings on H. R. 4480, 79th Cong. Nov. 15, 1945, p. 9). A total of \$75 million was expended on this project, mainly on lock-site excavations at Gatun and Miraflores, before work on it was suspended. The Terminal Lake Plan provides for removing all lock structures from Pedro Miguel and for regrouping of all Pacific locks at or near Miraflores, thus enabling uninterrupted navigation at the Gatun Lake level between the Atlantic and Pacific locks, with a greatly needed terminal lake anchorage at the Pacific end of the canal. As thus improved, the modified Third Locks Project can be completed at relatively low cost—estimated under \$600 million. The soundness of this proposal has been established by 40 years of satisfactory operation of a similar arrangement at Gatun.

(b) Construction of a practically new Panama Canal known as the Sea-Level Project, initially estimated in 1947 to cost \$2,500,000,000, and which would be of less operational value than the existing canal it was designed to replace, but which, under present conditions, would likely cost several times that amount. The Governor of the Panama Canal (a member of the Corps of Engineers) at that time definitely went on record as advocating none but the so-called Sea-Level Project for the major increase of canal facilities, which action served to exclude what may be the best solution when evaluated from all angles. This report, under Public Law 280, 79th Congress, was transmitted to the Congress by the President, December 1, 1947, and, significantly, without comment or recommendation. The Congress took no action, and the report was not published.

3. The Terminal Lake-Third Locks Project has been strongly urged as the proper form of modernization by experienced civilian engineers who took part in the construction of the present canal. They have spoken from personal knowledge of the original construction. Their views are shared by many independent engineers and navigators who have studied the subject. All these insist that the present lake-lock type should be preserved as supplying the best canal for the transit of vessels which it is economically

feasible to construct. They, together with many of the leading atomic warfare authorities, stress the points that the defense of the canal is an all-inclusive Federal responsibility which must be met by active military and naval measures and by industrial planning in the United States, that passive protective features embodied in construction design are inadequate, and that the proper bases for planning canal improvements are capacity and navigational efficiency. Moreover, it must be borne in mind that the effective destructive power of the atomic bomb has been tremendously increased since the formal recommendation for a sea-level canal. Any canal, whatever the type, can be destroyed by atomic bombing, if permitted to strike.

4. The recent authorization to expend funds for repairs and alterations of present lock structures at an estimated cost of \$26,500,000 is, as we believe, makeshift in character, and is without real merit. Consummation thereof, in lieu of fundamental improvements, will inevitably delay the basic and long-overdue solution of the problems involved.

5. In addition to the Panama projects, there are urgent proposals for canals at other locations, some of which have strong support, particularly Nicaragua. In developing a long-range Isthmian Canal Policy to meet future interoceanic transit needs, these should certainly receive full and unbiased consideration.

6. Transcending personal considerations, but nevertheless to state the matter candidly, we submit that the Third Locks Project, as originally planned in 1939 by the Governor of the Panama Canal, has proven most disappointing. We have every reason to believe that the insistently advocated Sea-Level Project (which, as a matter of fact, would require tidal locks as well as vulnerable flood-control reservoirs and dikes) would prove to be a monumental boondoggle, costing the American taxpayer billions of dollars. Both of these efforts were directed by routine administrative agencies, and at heavy public expense.

7. We wish to stress the fact that, aside from the A-bomb, the recurrent discussions as to the relative advantages and disadvantages of the lake-lock and sea-level types of canal were exhaustively investigated, debated, and considered in 1905-6 when the Congress and the President decided in favor of the lake-lock plan—under which the canal was constructed, and (with the exception of certain operational defects in the Pacific sector) has been successfully operated. The operational defects, we believe, can be adequately corrected.

8. It must be always borne in mind that the greater the cost of increased facilities at Panama the heavier will be the load on the already overwhelmingly burdened American taxpayer; and that also such cost must be reflected in ship-transit tolls, with all that increased tolls imply.

9. We respectfully urge the early enactment of H. R. 1048, 83d Congress, introduced by Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN, of Iowa and supported by Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas, who introduced a like measure in the 82d Congress [S. 766 and H. R. 3335, 84th Cong.] Both of these experienced and highly competent legislators have been thorough students of interoceanic canal problems, which have grave diplomatic implications affecting all maritime nations and the relations of the United States with all Latin American countries—especially Panama. As to Panama, we would most strongly emphasize that among the features overlooked in the report under Public Law 280, 79th Congress, is the fact that the Sea-Level Project recommended in that report is not covered by existing canal treaties and would necessitate the negotiation of a new treaty with a tremendous indemnity and

greatly increased annuity payments involved. As evidence of this it may be noted that upon demand of the Panamanian Government, and the appointment by it of a commission for the purpose, the United States Government has named a like commission, to negotiate various questions, including that of the present annuity of \$430,000 (originally \$250,000), which Panama insists should be substantially increased. These negotiations began in September 1953, when the President of Panama and members of the Panamanian Commission visited Washington in behalf of the indicated demands. [Treaty signed January 25, 1955, and ratified July 29, 1955.]

10. References to the Governor of the Panama Canal herein apply to the incumbent Governor at the time of the stated action.

CONCLUSION

Because of these considerations, it would seem to be clear that the indicated commission should be created without delay, and put to work, so as to develop a timely, definite, and wisely reasoned Isthmian Canal Policy. Such a body should be made up of unbiased, broad-gaged, and independent men of the widest engineering, operational, governmental, and business experience, and not of persons from routine agencies, all too often involved in justifying their own groups.

Respectfully submitted.

James T. B. Bowles, Baltimore, Md.;
Ralph Budd, Chicago, Ill.; Howard T. Critchlow, Trenton, N. J.; Roy W. Hebard, New York, N. Y.; Herbert D. Hinman, Newport News, Va.; William R. McCann, Hopewell, Va.; E. Sydney Randolph, Baton Rouge, La.; Hartley Rowe, Boston, Mass.; William E. Russell, New York, N. Y.; Caleb Mills Saville, Hartford, Conn.; John Frank Stevens, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Ellis D. Stillwell, Monrovia, Calif.; William G. B. Thompson, New Haven, Conn.; Robert E. Wood, Lake Forest, Ill.; Daniel E. Wright, St. Petersburg, Fla.

THE PETITIONERS

James T. B. Bowles: Chemical engineer; in charge water supplies, superintendent filtration plants, Canal Zone, 1910-14; lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers, AEF; director, secretary, and technologist of Crown Petroleum Corp.

Ralph Budd: Civil engineer; chief engineer, Panama Railroad, 1909-13; president, Great Northern Railway; transportation commissioner, the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense; president, Burlington Railroad; now chairman of Chicago Transit Authority.

Howard T. Critchlow: Civil and hydraulic engineer; district and chief hydrographer, Panama Canal, 1910-14; New Jersey Department of Conservation and Economic Development on water supply, construction of dams, and flood control; past president, American Water Works Association; now director and chief engineer, Division Water Policy and Supply (N. J.).

Roy W. Hebard: Assistant engineer, resident engineer, and contractor, Panama Canal, 1905-11; major, Corps of Engineers, AEF; president, R. W. Hebard & Co., Inc., builders of highways, railroads, waterworks, and divers structures throughout Central and South America.

Herbert D. Hinman: Construction engineer whose first job for the Pacific Division in 1907 was boring to find rock for the locks; assistant engineer in charge of construction of the Pedro Miguel locks, and later in the building of the fortifications on the Pacific side; president of Virginia Engineering Corp., engaged in divers heavy construction in Virginia and the Southeastern States.

William R. McCann: Assistant engineer and supervisor of construction, First Division, Panama Canal, 1907-14; engineer,

Stone & Webster, Inc.; engineer, Allied Chemical & Dye Corp.; project manager, Buckeye Ordnance Works; now consulting engineer.

E. Sydney Randolph: Civil engineer; Panama Canal service, 1910-46; office engineer, designing engineer, construction engineer, principal engineer, and consulting engineer, handling various projects such as technical supervision of maintenance and lock improvement, Madden dam and power project, exploration and investigations for additional locks, defense structures, emergency gates, increased spillway capacity, and augmented power facilities; now consulting engineer.

Hartley Rowe: Electrical and construction engineer, various divisions, Panama Canal, 1905-15; engineering and construction, Lockwood, Greene & Co.; member of General Advisory Committee, Atomic Energy Commission; chief engineer, United Fruit Co.; now vice president thereof.

William E. Russell: Panama Canal service, 1905-09, under all three chief engineers, attached to office of superintending architect, and engaged in building construction; attorney, New York City; chairman of the board of several magazines in which he has controlling interests; headed committee for reevaluation of housing in New York State; has been lifelong student of Panama Canal affairs, and of the treaties pertaining thereto.

Caleb M. Saville: Hydraulic engineer; in charge Third Division, Panama Canal, 1907-11, investigating foundations for Gatun Dam, flow through spillway, and Chagres River hydrology; manager and chief engineer, Hartford Metropolitan District; now consulting engineer thereto.

John Frank Stevens: Life student of Panama Canal problems; son of first chairman and chief engineer, Isthmian Canal Commission, who planned the construction organization and plant, and was largely responsible for the adoption of the lock-lake type of waterway.

Ellis D. Stillwell: Electrical engineer; served on Panama Canal, 1912-49, assistant superintendent Gatun locks, superintendent Gatun locks, and superintendent Locks Division in charge of lock operations and transits, and responsible for lock maintenance and biennial overhauling.

William G. B. Thompson: Civil engineer; Panama Canal service, 1909-16, supervising, among other assignments, construction of Balboa terminal; State highway engineer of New Jersey; vice president and chief engineer, Gandy Bridge Co., St. Petersburg, Fla.; with Allied Chemical & Dye Corp., as superintendent of construction and as project manager Kentucky Ordnance Works; now consulting engineer.

Robert E. Wood: Assistant quartermaster, chief quartermaster, and director, Panama Railroad, 1907-14; brigadier general, United States Army (retired), and later acting Quartermaster General; president, Sears, Roebuck & Co.; now chairman of the board thereof.

Daniel E. Wright: Civil engineer; Panama Canal service, 1904-18, as municipal and sanitary engineer, Central Division, extended subsequently to all divisions and to Panama City and Colon; contracting and consulting in Central and South America; with Rockefeller Foundation and United States Public Health Service as sanitary expert on various commissions to Middle East, Greece, France, Burma, China, India, Egypt, and elsewhere; captain, United States Army, World War I; colonel, United States Army, World War II.

DEAR MR. MARTIN: I feel a great deal of comfort because of your recent contribution—which is so important that I wish to comment at some length.

I am now a most interested spectator of developments concerning the Panama Canal,

as are also a number of other civilian engineers who collaborated in the work of the original construction and subsequent maintenance of the Canal.

The Governor's Report of 1947, under Public Law 280, 79th Congress, should not stand as the unchallenged rule for Congress in deciding upon the future development of our transisthmian canal. It would be better if it were considered to be a mere tentative proposition representing the views of a relatively small group of engineers—a challenge to American engineers.

However, because it is still officially unchallenged in its present position as a report to Congress, made by its direction and appropriation and backed up by a great deal of technical data, it may be difficult to persuade the people that it is not the ultimate solution, without an authorized independent investigation and another report to Congress. The readiness of writers to accept the findings of the report shows that the above is true.

The Governor of the Panama Canal, in organizing for the work culminating in his report of 1947, may have intended to attack the problems in an openminded manner, free from what might be called preconceived ideas. Perhaps, for that reason, he failed to employ some of those engineers of great ability who had helped to build and maintain the Canal and who undoubtedly could have contributed extensively from their store of well-digested knowledge, particularly of the treacherous terrain of the Isthmus, as to the best means for the economical development of the Canal as a channel for navigation of vessels.

As you have pointed out, there is urgent need of a supplemental investigation, leading to a separate report to Congress, and it should include a program of development, general plans, and estimates of cost for construction, maintenance and operation. This should be made with the advantages of specific Congressional authorization by a broad-gage group including some of those associated with the building of the Canal and its auxiliary facilities, organized and acting independently of the influence bearing on the former group, free to examine any and all data available to that group, and to consult with experts in other Government departments. Only then would Congress be fully informed and in a position to decide what is the best solution for the future development of the Panama Canal.

Such a supplemental investigation could be made for a relatively small sum of money as there would not be required much, if any, work of surveys, borings, or other costly field operations. Furthermore, it should be possible to get out such a report in less than 2 years.

We who question the 1947 report are acting only as individuals interested in the public welfare and are actuated by no other motive. We live in widely separated areas and do not possess, of course, all the latest technical data involved; but we speak from a wealth of practical experience and observation of Panama Canal construction, maintenance and operation and are familiar with many of the basic facts underlying the entire question.

The following are some questions that require decisions by the best informed persons, engineers and others:

1. Why should the Terminal Lake Plan (improved lock-lake canal) cost about \$2½ billion. The discarded bypass plan (1939 Third Locks Project) was estimated at \$277 million. Estimates in 1943 for the Terminal Lake Plan ran to \$283 million. The late Mr. H. O. Cole, in 1947, estimated \$500 million to \$700 million for the Third Locks Project modified to embody the Terminal Lake Plan ideas.

2. Why should locks as wide as 200 feet, as recommended in the 1947 report, be mandatory? Would not some smaller width be sufficient, and preferable from many viewpoints,

until an added flight of wider locks were known to be needed?

3. Why is it essential to widen Gaillard cut in the lock canal plans from 300 to 500 feet at the outset? Would not some smaller increase in width serve for many years?

4. With respect to atomic missiles striking the Canal, did the planners of the sea-level canal obtain opinions from the best available sources? What is the opinion of the leading atomic warfare authorities?

5. Is not the defense of shipping in the sealanes each side of the canal possibly a greater problem than the defense of the canal itself? If so, can the vast expenditures required for a Sea-Level Project be justified on the basis of national defense?

6. If defense is the controlling design factor, would not a passage at Tehuantepec, where the canal and Gulf of Mexico could be better and more economically defended, be a better or alternate solution? What would the Tehuantepec Canal cost as a lock-lake canal and as a sea-level canal through a tunnel? What would benefits be if there were the present commercial canal at Panama and another canal, principally for military use, at Tehuantepec, or some other point?

7. If an enemy were so powerful that he could destroy a canal, wouldn't he also have immobilized our shipping in the major ports of the United States and also our industrial potential? Would not a sea-level canal at Panama with tidal locks and many miles of dikes, be vulnerable to atomic attack as well as the present canal?

These questions are disturbing but cannot be overlooked in any complete evaluation of the problem. The civil engineering work involved in such a study would be considerable but would be simple in comparison with the problems of general location, type, size, and defense of the canal. These general features require the highest order of judgment from the broadest and most competent independent sources.

I was employed, in various technical capacities, from 1910 to 1946 by the Isthmian Canal Commission, the Panama Canal and Railroad, attaining the ratings of designing engineer, construction engineer, and consulting engineer at different times. My varied assignments included engineering supervision on locks, the Madden Dam project, drydocks, and other facilities for ships; hence am familiar with the basic engineering situation on the Canal Zone. Under the direction of the Governor, I supervised the explorations, plans and cost estimates leading to the 1939 Third Locks Report (the bypass plan). One feature of this plan was the separation of new and old locks wherein bends in channels were necessarily large.

After further investigation, I opposed the location selected for the Pedro Miguel locks on the grounds that the foundations as originally planned were poor. Subsequently, my work was taken over by others and the construction was commenced and later, May 1942, was discontinued.

Capt. Miles Du Val, United States Navy, while Captain of the Port, in charge of marine operations in the Pacific Division of the Panama Canal, developed and submitted the Terminal Lake Plan which I then supported strongly. I remain unconvinced that there is a better plan. It eliminated the Pedro Miguel locks and has other major advantages. Eventually, it was adopted in the 1947 report if a lock canal is retained; but, to the best of my knowledge, it has not yet had full engineering examination such as would be required before presentation to Congress.

Summing up: The Panama Canal is so remotely situated that the general public takes little interest in it; hence, your interest exhibited in your several extensions to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are of nationwide service of the highest order. In the interests of international relations, navigation, and

¹ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 13, 1950, Panama Canal Propaganda for Sea Level Project, p. A5087.

our national economy, the Isthmian Canal situation should be examined by an entirely unrestricted Inter-oceanic Canals Commission to fully explore all of the major angles of the subject and report to Congress. These views derive from my long career as a civilian employee on construction, maintenance, and operation of the canal and its auxiliaries, during which period I absorbed information from many sources and on a great variety of subjects.

Yours respectfully,

E. SYDNEY RANDOLPH,
Licensed Civil Engineer (Louisiana).

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., April 7, 1956.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: Your letter of the 2d instant requests my views, to include suggestions, as to what should be done to increase trans-Isthmian transit facilities. I am honored to present to you the observations following.

Under date of November 21, 1947, in response to Public Law 280, 79th Congress, 1st session, there was signed what is now generally known as the Mehafeey report. The report duly reached Congress shortly thereafter, but without any recommendation of the Executive. So far as I know, it has rested in the files ever since.

It is my belief this report should be made the basis of an early and thorough review of the whole problem. At the time it was submitted, I was inclined in favor of plan III. But since then, atomic science has so far advanced that the protective features of this and other plans are subject to serious review and reestimate, so that at present I am open to conviction without bias on any plan. I need to have more up-to-date facts to form a valid opinion.

I had been hoping your S. 766, 84th Congress, 1st session, and its companion, H. R. 3335—would have brought about the desired restudy before this. We now have aircraft carriers of too wide a beam to pass the existing Panama Canal locks. The increase of international commerce also approaches canal capacity unless there are to be costly transit delays. And as long as ships sail the seas, the canal is our strategic and logistic lifeline in time of war. I therefore hope that the provisions of your bill, or something parallel thereto, may be put in motion soon and bring action.

Respectfully yours,

GEO. R. GOETHALS,
Colonel, United States Army, Retired.

LACONIA, N. H., April 9, 1956.

Dr. Richard H. Whitehead, the first superintendent of the Pacific locks, author of Hydraulics of the Locking Operations of the Panama Canal and Our Faith Moved Mountains, and now president of Scott & Williams, Inc., described the Sea-Level Project as a "dangerous, unnecessary, and costly venture."

He recommended that consideration of the Isthmian problem should be undertaken by a civilian controlled commission.

HOOSICK FALLS, N. Y., April 26, 1956.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN:

I have been much interested in the discussions of operating difficulties on the Panama Canal and in the schemes proposed for correcting them and for increasing its transit capacity.

Most of the operating troubles appear to be due to groundings or to ships striking the banks, in Culebra Cut. This is caused by currents, set up by the operation of the lock at Pedro Miguel, which occasionally make control of ships difficult.

The Pacific locks (1 at Pedro Miguel and 2 at Miraflores) were constructed separately, rather than in 1 flight of 3 as at Gatun,

because it was then believed that suitable ground conditions for a triple lock at Miraflores was not available. It is now reported that it has been determined that a triple lock can be built there and that doing so would permit elimination of the flight at Pedro Miguel and set up a water storage which would eliminate the rush of water through the cut during lock operations.

Frankly I have never seen any detailed study of these proposals nor of the additional locks at Gatun which were started during the last World War, but I believe the solution lies in the continuance of a lock canal with corrective construction somewhat as outlined above.

I can't see how anyone who saw the construction of the present canal and the tremendous difficulties with slides and bank settlement could possibly favor a sea-level canal, which would multiply these troubles many times both in construction and in maintenance. It would undoubtedly require tidal locks on the Pacific end and on the whole would be as vulnerable to attack as the present installation.

Yours very truly,

ANDREW L. BELL.

HAVANA, CUBA.

DEAR SENATOR: Your letter of April 2 duly received. I entered the canal service in 1900 and was there as superintendent of dredging for 18 years, the first 7 years as an employee of the Panama Railroad at Balboa in charge of docks and keeping a channel open from Bay of Panama to the docks at Balboa.

I do not believe any of the men who advocate a sea level canal have any idea of the difficulties they would encounter at Culebra Cut. It was bad enough at the 85-foot level until the banks reached a state of repose. To go 85 feet (actually 100-110 feet) deeper would be a tremendous undertaking and I certainly would not consider such a proposal. I believe it was a mistake to build the Pedro Miguel locks as three stage locks as Miraflores would have answered the purpose and saved untold millions.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES MACFARLANE.

QUARRYVILLE, PA., April 7, 1956.

SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of the 2d regarding the Panama Canal. I understand that the present Governor of the Zone is in favor of a sea-level canal in place of the present lock type. I cannot agree with him as both types can easily be destroyed by bombing.

I spent 10 years on the Canal Zone in the engineering department. Governor Goethals was especially interested in the slides, so we kept a record of all slides that occurred. In 1916 he wrote an article on Slides of the Panama Canal and Donald F. MacDonald wrote Some Engineering Problems of the Panama Canal in their Relations to Geology and Topography, both by the Government Printing Office. If anyone thinks the slides at Panama are ordinary, let him read, at least, page 144 of History of the Panama Canal, by Ira E. Bennett.

One of the most consistent of the slides was Cucaracha. The old French company had trouble with it and as I had a former employee of the French I asked Mr. Raggi to see what he could find among the records. They had tunneled under Cucaracha and put in a timbered drain which did not last long and was a failure. As the French planned to use 12 locks in their canal, the difficulty of finding good foundations was paramount.

In their original plan the Americans expected to use a berm along the canal, with a 2-on-1 slope back of the canal. The last

time that I checked Cucaracha the slope was 1 on 13.

The elevation of the water in the canal is 85 feet above sea level, with a depth of 45 feet. For a sea-level canal, they would have to remove 90 feet of earth and rock, working up to 135 feet below the present water level. The earth and rock would have to be moved several miles back into the interior in order not to aggravate the slides.

While the sea-level canal was being constructed, would they close the canal to traffic? How will they dispose of the water coming down the Chagres River? At the present time we use 7 of the spillway gates at Gatun to carry off the excess water, each gate is 59 feet across and 19 feet high. More gates are available, but to use more would wash out the railroad bridge and possibly the hydro plant, below the spillway.

The sea-level canal would require locks, as the tidal range on the Pacific side is 20 feet, while that on the Atlantic side is 2 feet.

How many years would it take to construct a sea-level canal, my guess would be that your great grandchildren would not live to see the work completed, and it would require billions of dollars, and not just millions.

I hope that a commission will be appointed to investigate the addition of lock facilities at Panama and also include an investigation of the Nicaraguan canal project, rather than undertake the construction of a sea-level canal at Panama.

Yours very truly,

C. J. EMBREE.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.

DEAR SENATOR: There is no better way of tackling the great problem than your proposal embodied in S. 766 to establish a well qualified commission. The proposed make-up of personnel for this commission is excellent and should prove worthy of this great undertaking.

This is a big problem, requiring much study, careful consideration of many inter-related factors, and sound, mature judgment as to final decisions and recommendations.

The many factors involved cannot possibly be disposed of properly in the congressional committees. However, these committees do have a vital part, and should accomplish their part toward getting the big investigation and study started and underway without longer delay by recommending to the Congress the establishment of the proposed Inter-oceanic Canals Commission.

Sincerely,

W. L. HERSH.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 15, 1956.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN:

The subject of your letter is one that has been of great interest to me over the many years from the time that the Panama Canal was built. During this time I have read and weighed the material which was available to me. Due to the great changes written and which was considered authoritative, international affairs and many other factors which entered this monumental problem since some of the material was written and which was considered authoritative, of course must be reappraised.

For this reason, I feel that any single opinion that might be made as to the correct solution of the inter-oceanic canal problem might fall very short of the optimum solution. There is certainly no place for the cut-and-dried answer. Again an opinion based on a too close-up view might overlook some of the broader aspects of the problem.

It is my view that a matter as great as that of an interoceanic canal should be given to a commission, to collect all pertinent information, at home and abroad, to study and weigh this information and to consider all the possible solutions, to select the most promising of these considering their cost and advantages and to make recommendations.

As the writer believes that this is the intent and purpose of S. 766, I wish you god-speed in your efforts,

Sincerely yours,

SYLVESTER H. GRAUTEN.

TYRONE, PA., April 5, 1956.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: While I appreciate your opinion, expressed in your kind letter of the 2d instance, that my work on the Panama Canal and my long engineering experience qualify me to comment on the present interoceanic canal problems, the limitations imposed on me by advanced age make it difficult for me to put all my ideas on the subject into a letter. May I then inform you of them by reference to 3 articles on the subject with which I am in full accord. It is probable that all 3 are in your files.

The first is entitled "Isthmian Canal Policy—An Evaluation," by Capt. Miles P. DuVal, United States Navy (retired), which appeared in the Proceedings of the United States Naval Institute for March 1955.

The second, which you may not have at hand, is entitled "The Panama Canal: A Challenging Problem for the United States" and was prepared for the Military Engineer late in 1954 but, so far as I know, has not yet been published. This paper, by four engineers who had been connected with the canal during construction or subsequently, and in the preparation of which I had a very minor part, recommends further study of the current canal problems by an impartial and qualified commission. The authors, all familiar with topographic and geologic conditions, with construction conditions and some operating problems, agree that a sea-level canal at Panama cannot be built at any reasonable cost and is perhaps entirely impossible at any cost. They are, therefore, of opinion that the proposed Terminal Lake-Third Locks Plan is probably the most feasible so far suggested.

The third article, just published in the current issue of the United States Naval Institute Proceedings, for April 1956, is by Mr. E. S. Randolph, one of the coauthors of the second, and is entitled "An Engineer's Evaluation of Isthmian Canal Policy."

As the second article listed above has not been published it may not be in your files. If not, because of its importance, I recommend asking for a manuscript copy from the author, Mr. William R. McCann, Hopewell, Va. I feel sure he will be glad to supply it.

Yours very sincerely,

EDWARD C. SHERMAN.

BRADENTON, FLA.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I wish to advise that after 5½ years' continuous service in the Panama Canal, including both construction and operating activities, I am convinced that of the two plans for the enlargement of the canal which have been under discussion for the last 10 years, the plan calling for the retention of the present lock-type canal, with the addition of new and larger locks, as favored by the United States Navy, is greatly to be preferred to the proposed change to a sea-level canal.

Sincerely yours,

W. H. ROSE,

Brigadier General, Hon. Ret. List,
United States Army.

KNOXVILLE, TENN., February 28, 1956.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN:

Since I feel that increased capacity should be obtained as economically as possible—consistent with efficient operation—I favor the third-locks plan, in which a considerable investment has already been made. The Terminal Lake Plan has advantages in the speeding up of transits, and could well be used in connection with the third locks. Some added measure of security would also be provided by this combination of plans, and maintenance repairs would be facilitated. By increasing toll rates moderately, it should be possible to continue operation of the canal on a near-business basis, especially as transits continue to increase.

Sincerely,

HERBERT D. VOGEL,

Brigadier General, United States Army,
Retired, and former Lieutenant Governor,
Canal Zone, 1950-52.

TULLAHOMA, TENN., April 5, 1956.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN:

My active connection with the Panama Canal dates far back—1913 to 1916. I visited the canal early in World War II and discussed its problems with responsible officials directing construction and operation. I have kept generally familiar with the more recent public discussions and debates and have talked from time to time with experienced people who had knowledge and opinions on the interoceanic-canals problem. I worked on the development and use of atomic weapons, both during the war, with the Manhattan project, and more recently with the Atomic Energy Commission.

For what they may be worth, I give you here some of my general views:

1. An improved high-level lock canal is preferable to a sea-level canal.
2. Atomic and thermonuclear weapons—if delivered on the target—will put a sea-level canal out of service as effectively as they will a lock canal.
3. Navigation through the wide lake of a lock canal should be much better than through the narrower channels of a sea-level canal.
4. The cost of building a sea-level canal would be enormously greater than the cost of needed improvements to the lock canal.
5. The probability of blocking the canal by slides would be greatly increased in a sea-level canal.
6. The present locks should be replaced or supplemented by larger locks—large enough to take present and planned shipping.
7. The Pedro Miguel locks should be removed and the entire lift at the Pacific end should be accomplished by new locks near Miraflores.
8. Additional water for the summit level should be provided.
9. The narrow channels should be widened as required for good navigation.
10. When, and if, a new canal becomes necessary to carry our commerce, plans should be ready so that it could be built without undue delay.
11. The United States should provide for an agency to carry on a continuing review of all the problems connected with interoceanic canals.

Sincerely yours,

T. F. FARRELL,

Major General, Army of the United States, Retired.

LABOR OFFICIAL OBJECTS TO COMPULSORY UNION POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senate may soon be considering the so-called clean-politics bill, I believe a recent statement by a former CIO official merits the close study of all Senators and Representatives.

For that reason, I call attention to the statement by George F. Hinkle as it has been reprinted in the current issue of Human Events, the sprightly and provocative weekly news commentary published in Washington, D. C., which has the habit of printing news and releases which frequently fail to find prominent mention in other American journals.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR FRONT

A man who was a former CIO official and still is a dues-paying member of the United Auto Workers-CIO union, Mr. George F. Hinkle, strikes out sharply against labor's compulsory collection of dues for political purposes. "Millions of union members in this country," says Hinkle, "are being forced to contribute to campaign funds of political candidates these very same union members oppose at the polls. This is being done through the use of union dues money by labor leaders. Individual union members are being forced to make political contributions to candidates and parties as a condition of employment."

Hinkle went on to point out that, "All labor leaders are not in favor of this compulsory political activity by all union members. It is only those who have the desire to promote and foster their absolute control over all the citizens of our country and those who wish to promote their own socialistic ideals and are using the labor movement as a vehicle to be used toward attaining these ideals."

Hinkle, who is presently State commissioner of labor in Indiana, proposes passage of legislation to prohibit the use of dues money by union leaders in political campaigns. "I say," remarked Hinkle, "that the penalty for violation of this legislation and principle should be the denial of the right of that particular union or local union to have a union shop. I say that this proposal is not a so-called right-to-work proposal and it is not an anti-labor proposal. It is an antipolitical labor boss proposal."

PUBLIC DEVELOPMENT OF NIAGARA FALLS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the Denver Post of May 24, 1956. This editorial, published in the leading daily newspaper of the entire Rocky Mountain region, asks a very cogent question as to why some Senators from that area seem to favor public developments in their own region—such as the Colorado River storage project—but have opposed the public development of Niagara Falls by the State power authority of New York.

There is an old saying that "to have a friend you must first be a friend," and I think that the editorial in the Denver Post very clearly illuminates this undying bit of truth.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW NEARSIGHTED CAN OUR SENATORS BE?

On May 16 the Senate of the United States voted 48 to 39 in favor of granting the New York State Power Authority the right to develop a large hydroelectric project near Niagara Falls.

The vote came at the conclusion of a vigorous debate on public versus private power. Seven Republicans voted with the Democrats to carry the legislation. Four Democrats voted with the Republican minority against it. A bill to authorize private development by a combine of five companies was passed 262 to 121 in the House of Representatives during the previous Congress.

It is most unlikely that the prevailing views of either the House or the Senate can be reconciled in the present session. So the evident need for providing more than 1 million kilowatts of low-cost energy for the farms, homes, and industries of western New York State will go unremedied for another year. Why?

Well, under a provision of a 1950 treaty between the United States and Canada, Congress must decide who shall develop this international boundary river. The decision cannot be made, as in other cases, by the Federal Power Commission. And the development cannot be undertaken either by New York State or by private utilities without Congress' approval.

The treaty requirements thus brought about an opportunity for a clear and specific test of views on public power in the ideological sense. The issue did not involve a demand on the Federal Treasury. For the State power authority of New York would, under the proposal, finance the project with revenue bonds to be made available for purchase by the general public.

The power features of the plan were not, as with other public power projects submitted to Congress' decision, part of a multiple-purpose package, including irrigation, navigation, and flood control.

The issue was simply whether the Niagara River at this site should be harnessed by private individuals for profit, or by a public agency for service alone. And the Senate decided in behalf of the latter. Furthermore, by a majority of nine votes, the Senate directed that preference in the purchase of power produced at that project shall go first to municipalities, cooperatives, and other public bodies.

It is clear from the record of debate on the legislation, both in this and previous sessions of Congress, that prevailing opinion in New York favored public rather than private development. It is not clear whether the State's power authority act of 1931, or amendments to it sponsored by then Governor Dewey in 1951, carried any demand for the application of the same preference that is extended by Federal law to projects authorized and financed by the Federal Government.

There has been no massive public power development in New York State comparable to that of the Tennessee or Columbia River Valleys. Ninety-five percent of the electricity consumers of that State are served by private utilities. And the idea of restraining the monopoly practices and rates of private companies, by imposing the yardstick of public power through compulsory preference on the sale and distribution of publicly generated energy, is apparently not as widely accepted in the Northeast as it is in the Southeast or the Northwest sections of the country.

Many of those urging public development of the Niagara most strongly, including Mr. Dewey and Robert Moses, chairman of the New York State Power Authority, disassociated themselves with equal vigor from those

sections of the bill extending mandatory preference. And this was true, notwithstanding that the experience elsewhere in the United States and the prospects in New York State as well suggest a very substantial participation in the power benefits of such projects by private utilities, regardless of preference.

Now, this controversy and its outcome contain elements of real political significance to the Nation generally, to the West and to the Rocky Mountain empire in particular. We commend these points to the reflection of Senators ALLOTT and MILLIKIN of Colorado, Senators BENNETT and WATKINS of Utah, and Senator BARRETT of Wyoming, all of whom voted against the legislation permitting public development by the State of New York:

1. The contention of the private utility industry, that publicly financed power generation is adverse to the public interest as an article of capitalistic faith, is a false and self-defeating doctrine. It is a dangerous generalization which, in this case, collided with the views of the people of New York as expressed, (a) in actions of the New York Legislature, (b) as articulated by every governor of the State (except one) since 1900, and (c) as set forth in every New York Democratic Party platform since 1918 and every New York Republican Party platform since 1936.

Such a contention is, too, in conflict with the economic aspirations of the upper Colorado River Basin States. For the whole future of those States is tied to the conservation of their share of the Colorado River by a project, the feasibility of which is completely and irrevocably dependent upon the revenues from the sale of public power in the upper Colorado River storage project.

2. To have embraced the spurious generalizations of the utility industry in the case of Niagara ignored (a) the obvious local preference of the State of New York, (b) revealed as confused if not insincere the concept of partnership between Federal and local interests in the development of natural resources, and (c) drove a wedge between like-minded political allies in the whole matter of applying public power selectively, as the need and justification for it arises here and elsewhere in the Nation.

We do not propose that our Representatives and Senators permit themselves to be dragged into every public power venture under the threat of political retaliation against our own programs. Nor would we criticize dissent from and opposition to legislation proposing public power for which there is (1) no local need or demand, (2) no economic justification, or (3) honestly comparable alternatives to be supplied by investor-owned utilities.

But is it blind folly for our people in Congress to be suckered into untenable obstruction of public power, just as it is nonsense to rush headlong into every public power panacea that arises. This is an issue which cries out for discriminating thought and courageous action, neither of which was apparent in the vote of this region's five Senators on the Niagara issue.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCREASE OF MINIMUM POSTAL- SAVINGS DEPOSITS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further morning business to be transacted, without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 1873.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1873) to increase the minimum postal-savings deposit, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the pending bill was requested by the Post Office Department as means of reducing paperwork and cost in the handling of postal-savings accounts.

The Post Office Department does not believe the bill will work any hardship on persons who have made small deposits in the past or in any way discourage thrift, inasmuch as United States savings stamps are readily available at any depository post office for accumulating \$5 in smaller amounts. At the present time the limit is fixed at \$1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act of June 25, 1910, as amended (39 U. S. C. 756), is hereby further amended by striking out "\$1" wherever it appears therein, and by inserting in lieu thereof "\$5."

SALE OF INHERITED INTERESTS IN ALLOTTED LANDS IN THE TULALIP RESERVATION, WASH.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2094, Senate bill 3920.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3920) to authorize the partition or sale of inherited interests in allotted lands in the Tulalip Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

POLITICAL SITUATION IN WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I recall an old saying, "We have had a skirmish. We are going to have a battle."

In Wisconsin we have had a skirmish. Certain "king makers" have arranged the endorsement of candidates in a convention which has no legal authority, no basis in law.

I refer particularly to the actions of the Republican State convention in Milwaukee on Saturday, May 26, and more especially to the actions of a handful of self-appointed "king makers" who have

attempted to dictate the choice of a senatorial nominee in Wisconsin. What took place on the 26th of May is one of the reasons why the primary law in Wisconsin was passed. I wish to discuss for a few moments what occurred and how the "king makers," so-called, finally, according to the Milwaukee Journal, arranged to guarantee a \$150,000 jackpot. That has not been denied.

The basic facts are well known, but it is important that they be understood in proper perspective.

PEOPLE WILL CHOOSE, NOT "KING MAKERS"

Mr. President, in the first place, the decision of the Republican Party as to who its nominee shall be in the general election in November will be made in the State primary on September 11. It is the people who choose a senatorial nominee, and not a handful of unscrupulous individuals inside a party convention nor even a misguided majority of the convention itself.

I have complete confidence—more confidence than ever before—that the people of my State will utterly repudiate the backward moving actions of May 26.

WISCONSIN'S RECORD OF INDEPENDENCE

Of course, I fully respect differences of opinion. I have always said America was built on differences of opinion. The old saying, Mr. President, that "I do not believe what you say, but I will fight to the death for your right to say it," applies to this situation.

The convention had a perfect right to do as it pleased—to make its own mistakes. But the record of the past in my State—an independent-minded State, which does not like bossism—shows that where a Republican State convention has, unfortunately, strayed from the beam, when a few self-appointed "king makers" have professionally manipulated and stampeded a convention, then their conspiring has boomeranged. The record shows that invariably the convention endorsement has become, not the path to victory in September, but the path to resounding defeat for the endorsed candidate and victory for the unendorsed candidate. And that is what is going to happen in my State.

A few self-appointed "king makers" several times tried to purge a great governor of my State—Walter S. Goodland—and, without campaigning, he defeated them hands down.

The same self-appointed "king makers" tried to purge Wisconsin's most famous secretary of State, Fred Zimmerman—and he consistently defeated them hands down.

I have faith that once more the handful of political manipulators will find that they cannot boss the Republican Party of Wisconsin or the people of Wisconsin as a whole. They cannot blind the eyes of the alert people of Wisconsin to the realities of today's world.

Mr. President, Milwaukee is ringed about with Nike sites, 5 hours away from Siberia by fast plane. There are bombers in Siberia. Some of the self-constituted isolation-minded "king makers" think that the people of my State are isolationists. But the people have marched ahead with the facts of life. They have seen the march of events and

they understand them. I am confident that the people will support me.

But every realist knows that in any political race, there is a chance that the people might not.

If that proves to be the case—and I firmly believe it will definitely not be the case—then I will, of course, accept the people's verdict. I shall accept the verdict with grace, without any feeling of hate in my heart. No one could go through what I have gone through in the past 2 months in my State, with the great amount of hate and venom and misrepresentation involved, without realizing that this is a planned attack. And yet, Mr. President, I hold no hate in my heart. I have long since learned that for me to hate is to stab my own physical being. But my eyes are open, Mr. President, and I sense the situation. Later on I shall tell a story which goes back 3 years, but not today.

A man must live with his own conscience, and his own principles. There is something dearer than a seat in the United States Senate, and that is the ability of a man to be true to his beliefs and to be honest with himself and with his Maker.

I WILL CAMPAIGN ON OVERALL RECORD, NOT RETREAT ONE INCH

Second. The second basic point I should like to make is this: I have served in the United States Senate for 17½ years.

My record here—my literally thousands of recorded votes—can be seen and noted by everyone.

It is a record which includes securing the enactment of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway law; fighting for liberalized social security; for the small-business man, for the veteran, for the dairy farmers; and fighting in the cause of world peace.

I will campaign on that record. I will not retreat from it one iota. I do not propose to compromise my principle now, or ever, for the sake of so-called political expediency.

If anyone expects me to retreat from my policies—if anyone expects me to do a flip-flop, and to turn my back, for example, on the cause of world peace, through enlightened mutual security—then that person has another guess coming.

IKE'S RECORD OF FRIENDSHIP IS CLEAR

The question is repeatedly asked as to what the position of President Eisenhower might be on this matter.

I, for one, do not propose to comment in detail on this subject, because I do not believe it would be proper to do so.

I should like to point out, however, that time and again in the past, President Eisenhower voluntarily, on his own initiative, and despite all sorts of other burdens on his time, has most graciously commented upon my efforts on behalf of our country.

So have members of his able staff, on many occasions. I am profoundly grateful for his and their comments.

The record of the President's relationship with me is there, for all to see. And, as an indication of that record—a record of which I am humbly proud—I shall ask unanimous consent that, at the con-

clusion of my remarks, several public letters which the President had kindly sent to me be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of talk from my opponent as regards the issue of "our respective percentages of support for President Eisenhower."

Some people who take great pleasure in trying to sabotage the President falsely proclaim that they allegedly support him on domestic policies, even though they fight him tooth and nail on foreign policy.

They were for the Bricker amendment, thus opposing the President in every respect. What these persons do is to engage in phony arithmetic in relation to votes. They count up every conceivable domestic issue which is almost completely noncontroversial, and then they say, "See—look how I have supported the President."

But when the chips are down on a real issue—a major issue, an issue on which the President has staked his entire record, an issue which will matter more in the eyes of history than any other issue, say, the matter of world peace—then these persons eagerly sabotage the President.

World peace is not just another issue; it is a decisive issue.

The Civil Defense Administrator, Mr. Val Peterson, has estimated that if war should come it would cost the United States upward of 25 million casualties. Does that, therefore, sound like just one trivial issue? Does the issue of preventing mass slaughter on continent after continent, sound like just "one more issue"?

Yet, the saboteurs contend that they are allegedly "for the President."

The saboteurs of his foreign policy conspire with every conceivable Eisenhower-hater to defeat the President's international efforts. And then these saboteurs have the nerve to pretend that they are really whole-hearted supporters of Ike.

It is not the quantity of their votes, it is the quality of their decisive votes on the big issues that really counts. I refer to issues like protecting the Constitution from an unsound amendment which would paralyze the President's treaty-making power.

Any man can differ with the President on some issues. He does not expect complete conformity. He respects wholesome, honest differences.

But is it one thing to vote against a few of his suggestions; it is another thing to conspire with Eisenhower-haters to defeat the President on the most important of all issues.

Does my opponent repudiate the Eisenhower-haters in his ranks? Does he repudiate the vicious attacks, which have been made against the President's foreign policies, and against the members of his Cabinet and sub-Cabinet who have been loyally carrying out those policies?

Does he repudiate the boos at the convention, the cat-calls, the smearing of President Eisenhower's endeavors on the world scene?

Does he repudiate the two-faced quality of those who pulled the strings at the convention in praising the President with one breath and then passing resolutions denouncing key policies of the President in the next breath?

A SMELLY AROMA OVER \$150,000

My next point is this:

The State of Wisconsin is a clean State which, by and large, has kept itself free from shady influences which have tended to taint the record of some other States.

Unfortunately, an aroma has now been arising, a not very pleasant aroma, over financial phases of the intrigue against me which preceded the May 26 decision.

Why? Because Saturday a week ago, we saw how an individual who had completely withdrawn from the race several weeks previously, suddenly, in a matter of a few hours flip-flopped and decided to become a candidate.

The people of my State are asking "Why?"

This individual—my opponent—had announced, away back last year, that he intended to make a decision one way or the other about entering the race or declining to do so. He kept postponing his decision month after month, until January 1, 1956, and then for additional months.

Finally, he withdrew in April, after apparently taking soundings, and after noting the results of a private poll—a poll which was taken under the auspices of a Gallup-type group, a poll which was paid for by the Republican hierarchy, to show how the present speaker stood. The poll showed that my opponent would be overwhelmingly defeated in the primary; so, he withdrew from the race and announced to the people of his commonwealth that he would not be a candidate.

But then on May 25, in the final few hours, when he had not even been mentioned or nominated, he came back. Why? Perhaps the answer was given in a news story that day. The Milwaukee Journal reported that 3 or 4 individuals had apparently pledged the sum of \$150,000 personally to that candidate.

Mr. President, there was a little scare on the floor of the Senate a few weeks ago about a \$2,500 deal. It created quite a mess.

The disclosure by the Milwaukee Journal has never been denied. Yet those persons are the "king makers," and their names appear in the press. They pledged personally to the candidate \$150,000. They pledged it not to the party, but to him.

Where is this money supposed to have come from? The people are asking that question. I shall annex to my speech as exhibits excerpts from hundreds of letters which have already come to me—and more are coming in every day. They are saying, in effect, "Senator, this is no longer your fight; it is the people's fight."

Where is the money coming from? Inside Wisconsin or outside Wisconsin,

how could that large sum have been procured for a candidate who was not then even in the race, a candidate who had voluntarily retired from it completely several weeks previously?

The people are asking if once more the oil or gas crowd is at work, the crowd I opposed in my vote against the natural-gas bill. Wisconsin does not like the aroma which has arisen.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. No; I prefer to carry on with my speech.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the Senator has made some very serious charges against one of our colleagues in the House.

Mr. WILEY. I have asked some questions. I refuse to yield until I have concluded my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Wisconsin declines to yield.

Mr. WILEY. I expected something of this kind to occur, but I intend to get into the RECORD a speech that can be published without interference.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then, Mr. President, I call the Senator to order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rules, the senior Senator from Wisconsin cannot proceed but must take his seat.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I move that the senior Senator from Wisconsin be allowed to proceed in order.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I want a ruling on the junior Senator from Wisconsin's calling me to order. He has no business calling me to order on anything I have said. This is just another indication of who is in the fight.

Mr. McCARTHY. Because the senior Senator from Wisconsin impugned the integrity of a Member of the House, I called him to order. However, I move that he be allowed to proceed if he will proceed in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is requested. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Wisconsin may proceed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, people are asking, once more, if the oil and gas crowd is at work, the crowd which I opposed in my fight against the natural gas bill.

Wisconsin does not like the aroma which has arisen. Wisconsin is determined to keep itself a clean State—clean politically, clean in every other way.

With regard to the convention itself, let me say—

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator not yield, so that I may ask him a question?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have asked that I be permitted to continue to the end of my remarks, so that they may be printed consecutively without interruption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Wisconsin declines to yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, following the proceedings of the convention, a great many men who attended it, including those who have at times strongly disagreed with me—and I have letters to prove it—told me that they were absolutely disgusted over the results of the convention. This reaction was shared by many of the leaders of the Republican Party, by Republican county chairmen, and others.

At the conclusion of my remarks today, I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some of the comments, as they poured into my office immediately following the convention.

The issue is not, of course, between ALEX WILEY and the Republican Party, because actually I am convinced that the mass of the thinking Republican Party supports me.

The issue is not even between ALEX WILEY and leaders of the Republican Party, because a great many leaders support me.

The issue is between ALEX WILEY and a handful of backward-looking, would-be king makers. They do not mind giving Wisconsin a black eye, the Republican Party a black eye, or the Midwest a black eye, in their ruthless desire to purge an independent-minded Senator, a Senator who believes in a modern approach, not a 19th century approach, to world problems.

CONCLUSION

The issue, then, is joined. It is for the people of Wisconsin to decide on September 11. If the successful 17½-year fight for the St. Lawrence Seaway were to mean nothing to them—and I should like to include the connecting-channels-into-the-lakes fight—if my fight for the dairyman, the farmer, the veteran, the small-business men, the old folks were to mean nothing to our people, then they might vote for my opponent. But most of all, if they were not interested in saving world peace, then they might well vote for him.

If they were not to care whether America has friends and allies in the world, they might vote for him.

I do not believe this will prove to be the case. I have faith in the people of Wisconsin—in their judgment, in their independence, in their wisdom, in their sense of decency and fair play and right dealing.

They will not turn the clock back. They will not retreat into 19th century thinking.

Mr. President, in the course of these remarks I have referred to various materials which I am going to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point. I should like to list them now:

PAST MESSAGES FROM PRESIDENT

First. The first consists of three letters which President Eisenhower had sent to me, supplementing his many warm comments in person, regarding my efforts in 1953, in 1954, and 1955, in the administration's behalf. The letters relate to foreign policy, generally, the fight for protection of the Constitution, and the fight for the St. Lawrence Seaway.

I reprint these past letters only as an indication of the spontaneous reaction of our Chief Executive.

THE \$150,000 PLEDGE

Second. The second item consists of a Milwaukee Journal news clipping in the issue of May 26, referring to the fact that the campaign manager of my opponent confessed that my opponent's endorsement had first been cleared with three industrialists of Wisconsin, who had pledged to him \$150,000.

The question is, what kind of a country is this when endorsement of the nomination of a United States Senator has to be cleared with individuals?

And the second question is: "Where does the \$150,000 come from?"

That sum may seem like small money in some States, but it is a very, very big sum to be announced at the very outset of a primary in Wisconsin.

I have reported that numerous letters from my State suggest that oil industry money is included in that \$150,000 figure.

I am not personally making any charges at this moment. I am simply reporting the fact that the people of my State are deeply disturbed over this \$150,000 fund, and they want to know where it comes from.

The people of Wisconsin are not naive. They can put 2 and 2 together. They know, for example, that, according to a great many observers, in the past one of the principal sources of huge so-called liquid campaign funds, that is, funds readily available in huge amounts, has been the petroleum industry. I repeat, I am definitely not making any charges. I am simply reporting the reactions of a great many Wisconsinites.

SUPPORT FROM WISCONSIN

Third. Next, I am reprinting the messages which poured into my office from all over Wisconsin, protesting the convention's decision.

If, I wanted to, I could have doubled or even tripled the number of these messages which will be reprinted.

My purpose, however, is not to fill up a lot of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If you will look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. President, you will find I have not been in the habit of doing a lot of talking; I believe in action. I have been, until the past month or so, very busy in my committees. My purpose is not to take up more space now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these items be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I may say that I think the senior Senator who has been making completely unfounded insinuations against his opponent in the primary election—a man who is also an honored Member of the House of Representatives—

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I may raise a point of order to that remark, because I have not made any unfounded remarks.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President I think the senior Senator should answer my questions. I have some questions to ask him. He has made the statement that \$150,000 was pledged to Mr. Davis. I know that is untrue, completely untrue. He has also suggested that money came

from gas or oil interests. Now, if he has any evidence to that effect, he should take it before the lobbying committee. I know he has no such evidence to that effect.

Mr. WILEY. Do not be too cocksure, Brother. [Laughter].

Mr. McCARTHY. Let the Senator tell us, if he has it. Does he have any evidence to support his accusation?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator is not running a committee. If he has a question, let him ask it.

Mr. President, I ask him to ask the question.

Mr. McCARTHY. Very well. I shall repeat the question.

Mr. WILEY. Go ahead.

Mr. McCARTHY. What evidence does the Senator have as to where the funds for Davis originated?

Mr. WILEY. I have answered that in my speech, but I shall answer it again. First I shall answer a part of the earlier statement. This appears in the Milwaukee Journal of May 27:

Robert Dalton, Brookfield, who helped in the drive, said that the Davis boom had been cleared with William J. Grede, a Milwaukee industrialist and GOP finance chairman; Walter Harnischfeger, another Milwaukee industrialist, and Thomas E. Coleman, Madison, former State party chairman and fund raiser.

"Davis is a protege of Coleman. This group has guaranteed to raise a \$150,000 campaign chest for Davis if he were endorsed," Dalton said.

That is verbatim from the Milwaukee Journal.

Where does the \$150,000 come from? Go and ask the kingmakers; do not ask me.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator knows better than that. The Senator knows the reputation of the Milwaukee Journal for accuracy. He knows it has an outstanding reputation for inaccuracy. Surely, that newspaper is not a competent authority for the charge he is making. Moreover, even the newspaper article to which the Senator refers makes no reference at all to oil and gas interests. Where is the Senator's evidence for that? Surely the Senator does not want to let a charge of that sort against a Member of the House stand if he has nothing with which to back it up. The Senator has also listed the names of persons who believed he was not a competent Senator. They have a right and duty in the circumstances to oppose the Senator, do they not? I repeat that the charge about a pledge of \$150,000 is completely untrue.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, let me tell you something. The night my colleague entertained Mr. Kersten, then a candidate, Kersten made the statement that he was going to have the support of my colleague. The following day the \$2,500 gas business broke, and the next day my colleague came over to me on this floor and said that he was not interfering in the primary. I accepted that as 100 percent correct, because when he ran 4 years ago I told him I would take no action in the primary. I expected that when he told me voluntarily he would take no action in the primary that was 100 percent correct.

I have accepted it as 100 percent correct until today.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a point of personal privilege. That is incorrect. I told the Senator I would make no public speeches in the primary. I have never told him that I would take no part in the primary. Now, I say I did take a pretty active part in the convention. I am very proud of the part I had in it. But when the Senator talks about "kingmakers," I wish to say the one-thousand-seven-hundred-odd delegates who voted against him were the "kingmakers." They are the rank and file of the Republican Party—my party of the State—and they voted as they did because they were unhappy with the record of the senior Senator.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I came to the floor to lay some facts before the Senate. I am glad at long last that, out of the hole, certain other facts are coming. Now I know, which I did not know until right now, that the junior Senator was particeps criminis in this kind of thing. I will say the people of Wisconsin will decide. If I have any sense of direction at all, the people are going clearly to say to these "kingmakers" and everybody who participated with them, "We are through with this kind of tactics. We want things aboveboard."

Even at the convention, I led on the first ballot, and enough votes were pledged the night before. The thing was nicely arranged, but I did not know who arranged it. But now I am beginning to obtain knowledge in large chunks.

Mr. President, in the beginning I said I have no personal conflict with my opponent. I have known him for a long time. But I ask these questions.

Two weeks before, Mr. Davis announced to the people that he would not be a candidate. At that time there was no pledge of \$150,000 forthcoming. The Milwaukee Journal reported that during the convention, according to Mr. Dalton, of Brookfield, who helped in the drive for Mr. Davis, \$150,000 was guaranteed to Mr. Davis, and the guarantors were named.

I wish to say that I have known these gentlemen. I have nothing against them personally. If they act within the Corrupt Practices Act, they have a perfect right to give all the money they legally can. But, of course, we differ on an ideological basis.

I recognize that the world has been shrunk by men's ingenuity, and I recognize that closed minds will not protect America. They are still isolationists. When they talk about our spending our money in Korea, they should realize that every dollar we spent in Korea saved many times what we would have had to spend if we had to send our own troops there in place of the Koreans and other allies. From General MacArthur down, every general in charge has said that we must not abandon our farflung defense line, that is where the defense line is—beginning at Alaska, through the Aleutian Islands, through Korea and Japan and Formosa and down to the Philippines. We are also spending some of our money in Formosa. These critics speak of the giving away of our money, by

means of military aid. But, I say we are saving many, many dollars by having the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa stand on the front line. So, Mr. President, that is where I differ with these folk. They do not see eye to eye with me. They have the right to disagree.

Again I ask, Where is the money coming from? Why was there, at the convention, a change from a man not being a candidate to becoming one? The people want the answer. Was the change caused by the \$150,000? What other pressures were put on? Who else put their fingers in the pie? Who promised them what? We shall see, Mr. President. In the days ahead, we shall see where the other promisers came in. Three months from now the people will make the decision.

Mr. President, as I have said, I have here the letters from President Eisenhower and excerpts from numerous letters showing the attitude of Republicans in Wisconsin as to the action which was taken.

Mr. President, no personalities are involved. The people resent this new idea in Wisconsin of certain men seeking to dictate the nominee. They will find they cannot.

Mr. President, in a few days I shall have something else to say about what developed. I shall also show what the newspapers of the State have said almost unanimously—and completely contrary to what has been said by the Chicago Tribune. I shall also show how the independents think, and then I shall trace the fight back to a certain period 3 years ago, when then and there was hatched the revolt because this Senator would not toe the mark, would not take orders, would not accept dictation to be ruled by the thinking of others.

EXHIBIT 1

LETTERS FROM PRESIDENT EISENHOWER TO
SENATOR WILEY

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 28, 1953.
The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ALEC: Today Foster Dulles, who was in my office on some business matters, took occasion to praise in extravagant terms your service as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee over the past 6 months. I just wanted to tell you how very greatly pleased I am that you and Foster have been able to see eye to eye and work together as such an effective team in carrying on these delicate and important activities.

Of course, I have personally been following the record that is made on the floor of the Senate, but it was encouraging to have evidence from Foster that you are fully as effective in committee as you are in the more public places.

You have been a great champion of the principles that the entire administration believes outline the best interests of the United States in the foreign field.

With warm personal regards,
Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 2, 1954.
The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ALEC: In the turmoil of the past few days, I have neglected to send you a

little note to tell you how greatly I appreciated your fine help in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1. For your stalwart assistance in defeating the proposed amendment, I am not only personally grateful; I think I express the thanks of the millions of Americans who realized to what extent such an amendment could have damaged our relationships with other nations of the world.

With warm personal regard,
Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 14, 1954.
The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Now that the St. Lawrence Seaway struggle is over, I want to thank you for your informed and aggressive leadership in this historic effort. This kind of legislative-executive teamwork in areas vital to all our citizens is, in my opinion, essential to a sound government and to the welfare of the Nation.

I am very pleased that you were able to move so effectively in helping to make the seaway at last a reality.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

EXCERPT FROM PAGE 1 OF MILWAUKEE JOURNAL,
MAY 27, 1956

Robert Dalton, Brookfield, who helped in the drive, said that the Davis boom had been cleared with William J. Grede, a Milwaukee industrialist and GOP finance chairman; Walter Harnischfeger, another Milwaukee industrialist, and Thomas E. Coleman, Madison, former State party chairman and fund raiser.

CORNERED IN CORRIDOR

DAVIS is a protégé of Coleman.
"This group had guaranteed to raise a \$150,000 campaign chest for DAVIS if he were endorsed," Dalton said.

EXCERPTS FROM WISCONSINITE'S LETTERS OF
SUPPORT OF SENATOR WILEY

From Waukesha:

"Well, Senator, the battle is over as far as Milwaukee is concerned and you are the winner even if the moneybags turned you down. I attended a veterans' meeting last night and did not find a veteran who was for Glenn. One of our county officials attended a meeting at the Avalon Hotel last night and she tells me that all they talked about was the bundle that was going to be raised. I look for you to win by a bigger vote than you ever did and I am going to do all I can for you.

"In my estimation you are doing a fine job; you are working earnestly and honestly for the best welfare of the country and the State; and you should be continued in office as long as this continues to be the case and you wish to run. In addition, you have grown with your job and are doing an immeasurably better job now than you were even a few years back.

"The Republican Party of this State has somehow fallen into the hands of some narrow-minded individuals. Many of us honor you for your worldwide view of our economic problems. Personally I feel that it would be a loss to the State and to the Nation not to have you a Member of the United States Senate."

From Clintonville:

"Our assemblyman brought down some nomination papers of yours today, which were circulated in the shop. I am told that many people said, 'Here is one I want to sign.' Unless I am completely devoid of political acumen, I feel your chances of suc-

cess are greater now than ever. Best of luck to you."

From Cross Plains:

"Well the boys at Milwaukee did it, or think they did; and I hope they will get a good trimming. I just wish you were able to get to many of the towns where there are picnics, and could give a talk or at least be introduced. I know you can beat your opponent and I will do all I can to help you."

From Milwaukee:

"Unhappy with endorsement of Davis by State Republican Party in Milwaukee Saturday. Want to work to help assure your nomination in September. Please advise who to contact."

From a clergyman:

"Ours is not a political church, nor am I a political preacher. The events of Saturday's convention of the Republican Party, State of Wisconsin, prompt me, however, to write this letter.

"Putting it briefly, I am shocked at the action of the convention. You have served our State with dignity and distinction. Your service in Congress, particularly in the Foreign Affairs Committee, has been of so high a quality, and the experience which you have acquired there is of such value both to our State and our Nation, that I consider it the height of folly to squander this by replacing you with a man whose chief qualification would be his youth, with all the lack of experience which that implies.

"It is certainly my opinion that if you will decide to enter your name in the primaries, nevertheless, your following will be sufficiently strong to win you the nomination in spite of the lack of the convention's endorsement. Whatever I can do as a private citizen will be done gladly in support of your renomination."

From Juneau:

"I want to express my admiration for you and the courageous fight you are waging against the political racketeers and 'king-makers' who call themselves the Republican Party in Wisconsin.

"Your phrases 'kingmakers' and 'let the people decide' has a great appeal and don't you worry, Senator, if you go directly to the people with your record you can win again. There are very few men who have gone up to Washington with an enviable record such as you have made. You refused to be led around by the collar like the man who was chosen will surely be. Your record on the waterway, the gas bill, the tidelands oil, and your battle for the farmer of Wisconsin, made a record that is hard to beat.

"I want you to know that I am a strong union man and I know how labor thinks and acts and you would be surprised if you knew how the workers are turning to you. I'm working for you, ALEX, as I have always done. Keep up the battle and we will see you in, come September and November."

From Kenosha:

"The Milwaukee episode was utterly disgusting, but I have known some of the insurgents in other Wisconsin political situations, and they merely got you votes by their action. Good fortune."

From Hancock:

"I was very happy indeed, reading the Sunday morning edition of Milwaukee Journal, your statement that you were going to battle it out in the primaries this fall for your seat in the Senate. I was a delegate at the convention at Milwaukee, and stayed with you until final poll, there were also several others in our county delegation for you, but our delegation has a ruling that on third poll a majority made it unanimous, believe some of them wanted to go home, I also believe that if poll for United States Senator had been made prior to Wisconsin attorney general poll, that you would have made it in second poll. This political control of party by a few self-appointed individuals is a very vicious element and a practice in our State I am not in favor of or never will be. I tried to get to

you after the second poll but was unable to do so."

From West Bend:

"What has transpired the past few days has made us here at the company more united than ever and to show you we mean it, are enclosing herewith a few checks to back up our convictions that the Honorable Senator WILEY will be reelected this fall."

From Eau Claire:

"Incidentally, I was glad to read that you intend to enter the primary in the fall and believe you can win the nomination and the election. As a retired pastor, I can appreciate your position, for the person who does something for his constituency is bound to displease some for it is impossible to please everyone. God bless you."

From Kaukauna:

"I want you to know how badly we feel about the sad turn of events. However, I want you to know that we do not agree with the action taken by the Outagamie County Republican committee. We wish you lots of success in the coming election, and are confident things will work out well for you."

From Milwaukee:

"Believe me, Senator, when I say that I felt very sorry, and the same time my blood pressure was going up more and more, the more I thought of the raw deal that you received at the convention. To think that they would abuse a man like you, after all you did for the welfare of the State. I am just one man of no special importance, but I shall do everything—even go house to house, in order to show them that there are still people that they cannot dictate to. You, Senator, have proven your worth in the Senate. Other men will have to prove themselves in order to come up to your standard, Senator WILEY. Please provide me with any advertising that may be forthcoming during the coming campaign. God bless you, and the best of everything."

From Madison:

"I believe the endorsement of your opponent was most ill-advised. I am certain that the delegates permitted a stampede without reflection as to the real contingency in the accomplishment of their purpose or as to the secondary effects. The convention delegates did not realize that there would be 3 more congressional elections before the expiration of another 6-year term and that if the Republican Party would again gain control of the Senate or the House that it would be nice to have our senior Senator again head the Foreign Affairs Committee."

From Thetford Center, Vt.:

"A native of Wisconsin, but not having lived there for a number of years, I nevertheless have continued my interest in Wisconsin's public affairs. I regret noting in the press the action of the Republican convention at Milwaukee regarding your candidacy to succeed yourself as Senator for another term. I have taken a considerable pride in your leadership in the Senate on matters of high importance in our foreign relations and would like to see you return for another term to help in these crucial years ahead. I should regret to see someone take your place, who has not yet sensed the kind of world we are now living in. Your leadership is needed and I hope the forward-looking people of Wisconsin will wake up by election day."

From St. Paul:

"It was with a great deal of disappointment that I read of the failure of the Wisconsin Republican Party to grant you their endorsement for the 1956 senatorial campaign. Although I am a student at the University of Minnesota, I am a resident of Wisconsin. In my humble opinion, Senator WILEY, you have discharged your duties faithfully and well. My admiration for you comes only from your record of loyalty to our State and Nation and that your efforts should be met with such lack of gratitude by the Wisconsin Republican Party is both shocking and shameful. I am confident

that the voters of Wisconsin, myself included, will repudiate this move by returning you to the office you have held so well, and so richly deserve. Pledging every support to you during the campaign and with best wishes for success."

From Milwaukee:

"Here are two votes from a family of independent voters—two votes for WILEY."

From Madison:

"Although I am not a member of the Republican Party, I am thoroughly disgusted with the banal platform they concocted at their State convention in Milwaukee. Further, I feel that they have seriously erred in failing to nominate you as their candidate for reelection. You have my support for 1956—and to prove it, I am enclosing a small contribution to assist you in your campaign."

From Milwaukee:

"The events prove that we must pitch in that much harder and while I seldom participate in a political campaign except to vote, you may depend on me for a moderate contribution to your campaign. I do not like double dealing in politics or even attorneys who take money in washrooms, even as a fee. Keep your chin up. And be thankful for such a gracious and supporting wife."

From Crandon, Wis.:

"Was indeed sorry to hear that the convention did not endorse you, but if it were I—some of those people there—I would not want their endorsement. So get in there and start pitching and we will win yet."

From Shawano, Wis.:

"It is difficult to understand the thinking of the party leaders. You are the first Wisconsin Senator since Senator La Follette to acquire a high committee standing in the Senate, and you have done more for Wisconsin than all our other representatives combined. In my opinion, the action in Milwaukee was disgraceful, but such is politics. I am sure the people will see the light and reelect you by a large majority."

From Wausau, Wis.:

"In 1951 I went with Taft. Subsequently the Eisenhower power in our county asked me as a Republican to go along with Eisenhower. I did. After that I was on the executive board of our county."

"Now the Republican Party of our county went against Taft and now they are going against Eisenhower, because of their vote against you."

"There is no leadership in Milwaukee to carry out the principles of Eisenhower. They hurt you at Milwaukee even with the split vote. If they had leadership they should, on past record, have given you the total."

"In conclusion, I was a Taft man. I am for you. What can I do to help?"

From Kenosha, Wis.:

"The result of the Republican State convention is an unmasking, therefore a great help for your victory in September and November. Now the people of Wisconsin know who its enemies and yours are; the isolationists in these modern times. Thanks to God, they are only few in comparison."

"Congratulations for what you said (quoted in the Milwaukee Journal)."

From Waukesha, Wis.:

"The politicians who refused to endorse you at Milwaukee this past weekend are not the fellows who put you in office. Most of us don't follow that crowd even in the second district."

"The primaries will tell the real story. I'm sure the real Republicans of the State of Wisconsin will repudiate the endorsement of the Republican convention at Milwaukee."

"So take heart, Senator. You have many real friends in your stable who will back you in your fight for reelection; for it's also our fight to keep the right man in the job."

From Beaver Dam, Wis.:

"May I join the ranks of those who wish you well in the senatorial nomination race? As a Democrat and constituent of Congressman DAVIS, the action of the Republican convention was incomprehensible to me."

"I believe that you have served the people of Wisconsin well, and party affiliations will not prevent me from working for your reelection and supporting you on the major issues for which you have fought so well."

From Milwaukee, Wis.:

"I want to thank you for all you have done for us in the State of Wisconsin. You can rest assured that you have done all in your power to further the cause of peace for our Nation and the world."

"I attended the caucus and convention held in Milwaukee and enjoyed talking with you and Mrs. Wiley. I tried very hard to have people vote for Senator WILEY. Your unit did give you its full unit rule of 43 votes on the first ballot, but as things went along, the pendulum swung the other way."

"Since then, quite a few of us have talked to people, or else the people have come to us, saying that since the demonstration at the convention, they felt you should remain in your office for another term."

"I think that the publicity, even though not too favorable, will aid you in your reelection. As you yourself said, let the people speak, and I am sure they will do so very loudly."

"May God bless you and your good wife who is really a wonderful person. My prayers go with you."

From Milwaukee, Wis.:

"I will do everything I can to campaign for you. As you have served the State and Nation, so every well so much better than our other Senator. You have been instrumental in furthering the St. Lawrence Waterway which surely is to the advantage of our State. You truly have served the State well and I feel confident that the voters of the State will not let you down."

"To me the State convention did not express the thought of the voters. Yours for victory."

From South Wayne, Wis.:

"I am gratified that you had the courage to declare you would enter the State primary even though the State Republican convention did not endorse you. This should show folks who appreciate deeds more than words that the people in control of the party machinery have some selfish ideas. How can they pretend to support President Eisenhower and yet repudiate their representative in the Senate who has supported the President's policies—especially the foreign policy?"

"You are in a position to understand its problems more than anyone else, especially one with no experience."

From Cedarburg, Wis.:

"We were shocked the other evening when we learned what the so-called leaders of the Republican Party in Wisconsin had done at the convention."

"May we say that we class ourselves as independent voters and we have regularly supported you. The reason for our support was because you seemed to stand for the things we believed in. We have admired your work in the Senate."

"The leadership as it manifested itself at the convention was perfectly willing and anxious to turn down a man who has integrity, standing, and seniority so that his influence could be felt. A man who has consistently supported the Republican President (who incidentally is the only man who could win a national election for the Republican Party). Such a man was turned down for a nonentity."

"I cannot help but say rather frankly and quite emphatically that such leadership smells."

From Clintonville, Wis.:

"I was very sorry to hear what happened at Milwaukee last week, and while I always leaned toward the Republican Party in the past, I am thoroughly disgusted with their recent action in not endorsing you for reelection.

"Certainly, your past record as our senior Senator is one of which we are justly proud, and I know that I am voicing the sentiments of many of my friends in this vicinity. We simply cannot comprehend the action of the State's Republican Party.

"Anyhow, I want you to know that you have very many loyal friends who are for you all the way and have not forgotten how you have supported our great President wholeheartedly and always worked for the best interests of Wisconsin and our country, and I cannot help feel that time will prove that a loyal and efficient servant you have been to the voters of Wisconsin, and I, for one, hope in all sincerity that you will be our Senator from Wisconsin for many years to come."

From Sullivan, Wis.:

"Rest assured that we fully appreciate the good work you have done during your past 18 years in the Senate, and no doubt will continue to do in the future.

"The Republican State convention chose to take the lowest, most intolerant course of action attesting to their moral bankruptcy, hypocrisy, brutality, ingratitude, and disrespect for their own senior Senator of their own State.

"Such ruthless, incompetent, and ungrateful individuals are not fit to govern themselves much less to select those to represent the good and honest citizens of this grand State of Wisconsin.

"From what I hear in this community most of our people are fully behind you and are getting sick and tired of the chicanery at these political conventions.

"In full appreciation of your good work and with best wishes for your continued success, I remain."

From Madison, Wis.:

"It has been a frustrating experience to sit here in Madison watching the shenanigans of the GOPers in Milwaukee today. When will they ever learn? I asked my son to express my regrets at my inability to be present because of illness, but he tells me that after 10 minutes of looking in he discovered all decisions had been made, and he is too busy a person to wait for the puppeteer to pull the string, so he came home. I am sure there must be many others who feel the same way.

"May I offer my congratulations that you did not get the endorsement? You will go further without it."

From Oconomowoc, Wis.:

"We were extremely sorry you didn't get Republican backing at the convention and are writing now to urge you to fight for your position.

"We are on your mailing list, so we have been following your work for a long time and feel you have our interests and our welfare always in mind."

From Clintonville, Wis.:

"I can assure you that you will win both in the primary in September and in the election in November better now than if the convention had given you their endorsement. You have served Wisconsin faithfully, and I am sure the people will back you to the limit. There are, of course, times when I have not agreed 100 percent with you, that is the way for a Republic to be. The people have the right to think as free people should. This is the good old United States of America, and conditions cannot become like in Russia, where people cannot even dare to think for themselves. Be assured we will support you at the polls. Best of wishes to you, and you will win."

From Milwaukee, Wis.:

"Just a note to tell you that I am on your side on this failure of endorsement conven-

tion just concluded here in Milwaukee. I agree with all the Milwaukee Journal said in its editorial last night about shabby treatment given you by the delegates to this convention. I have been a Republican all my life, but sometimes get pretty ashamed of our party. I have been ashamed of the treatment accorded our great President and ashamed of the treatment accorded you. You will be vindicated on September 11 and later on this fall."

From Racine, Wis.:

"Just a note to say we have followed your recent experience at Milwaukee very closely. We believe the attitude taken is entirely out of line and entirely uncalled for. And, incidentally, we are not the only ones in this vicinity who have the same opinion.

"We are glad to note that you are going into the fight with the determination that some people sometimes go the wrong way, as at the Milwaukee convention. We believe you will put it over. We are with you all the way, 100 percent.

"Rest assured I will continue to talk you up on every occasion possible to the end, and that I will do my part in making your every effort successful."

From Benton, Wis.:

"I want you to know how sorry I am that the Republican convention did not see fit to endorse you at the Milwaukee meeting Saturday, and I want to urge you to keep up the fight for the nomination. I was very happy that the delegation from Lafayette County stuck solid for your endorsement. At no time during the balloting was there any thought of changing our support. It is amazing to me how few people in an organization as big as the Republican Party of Wisconsin can start a steamroller in reverse and have them carried away by hysteria, mob rule, or whatever it was that struck them.

"Keep up the fight. The rank and file of people will support you if you continue to give them the facts as you have in the past."

From Northena, Wis.:

"This is to let you know that, despite the recent action of the State Republican Party I personally shall continue to support you. Last Thursday night I wrote an editorial for this week's issue indicating this support; the official GOP action has in no way altered my decision to print that editorial.

"While I have not always agreed with you, it would be unnatural for 2 individuals to be in 100 percent agreement, I am personally satisfied that you deserve reelection. Best of success in your campaign."

From Milwaukee, Wis.:

"Just a few more words of encouragement in your coming campaign to retain your Senate seat. I'm sure many, many Wisconsinites have viewed the recent Republican convention in Milwaukee with as much disappointment as I have. Your representation of Wisconsin in Washington has always been consistent with both our national and international needs and demands, and I am sure that our citizens will reject the present attempt by the few to force another reactionary candidate down our throats.

"There are many of us working for your victory and the defeat of the big-money dictators this coming fall. Be sure this is one vote they will never buy. (And they'll find \$150,000 won't be near enough to bribe the Wisconsin citizenry)."

From South Milwaukee:

"I'm sorry to hear that the Republican convention did not pick you as their candidate—but the people will.

"You have a fine record in the Senate and I am sure in the primary your vote will be at least double your opponent's. If there is any way that you wish me to help you in your campaign please call on me."

From Monroe:

"I was a small part of the initial movement in 1951 and 1952 for the citizens of Eisenhower. It was during this period that the Republican leaders of Wisconsin would not accept the known will of the people and remained with their isolationist ideals until almost the bitter end. During this period I tried to fulfill my position in the first Congressional District until I was recalled into the United States Navy.

"You may rest with confidence that another revolt to common welfare and logic will supplant the dictative patterns of a biased group who have remained with an old, betrotten and outdated ideal."

From Clintonville:

"I am sure that the people of Wisconsin have not forgotten the services which you have rendered this State.

"I can assure you of my continued loyal support and that I will actively work for your nomination."

From Augusta:

"I will be forwarding your nomination papers in a day or two and if there is anything else I can do for you in my community or in the State, I will surely be glad to do it for you. I am going out and battle for ALEX WILBY for Senator and will be very glad to sit in with your committee, if necessary, to form a nucleus to put you over in Wisconsin."

From Whitefish Bay:

"It is with great regret that we find the Republican leaders of the State of Wisconsin to be so shortsighted and apparently selfishly guided by vested interests to the degree that people are sacrificed regardless of their excellent record in the interests of the good of all. Plainly we mean that we think the Wisconsin Republican Convention just finished is an outright expression of the old saying, 'That the people be damned.' They have decided in their selection of another candidate to be endorsed by the party rather than recognizing your splendid record of action in the interest of American welfare. We want to tell you that it is our hope that all of the people will study their behavior and not miss the implications in their decision in the coming election. We assure you that we, because of our interest in public life as public school people, do recognize and appreciate your services and beliefs that you have practiced as United States Senator from Wisconsin. We want you to go ahead with faith and determination in the belief that you will be continued as Senator in the next election."

From Hudson:

"I was very much perturbed over the action taken at the State Republican Convention last week. I consider myself a party man, but I cannot and will not abide by the convention dictate in your case. It would seem that some of our people, a very few, I hope, gave no thought whatever as to what happened in the former labor Democrat presidential election this spring in our neighboring State of Minnesota. The two cases are very similar, and I predict that the thinking voters will give you a good majority. I was very happy to have already had the privilege of signing my name to your nomination papers and will hold to my conviction that you have given Wisconsin and the whole Nation the best representation that is possible. Your good works will not be forgotten come election time."

From Madison:

"May I disclose to you my personal feeling of resentment at the action taken by the Republican Convention in Milwaukee? In the refreshing colloquialism, I hope you go on to lick the socks off of their candidate in the primary."

From Watertown:

"I have always been an admirer of your work in the Senate. True, I have often disagreed with you on specific legislation, but you have acted with integrity and have attempted to serve the interests of your State

and the country at large. I am a young mother of four children, and my time and energies are necessarily limited. However, if there is anything I can do to help further your campaign, any way in which my small voice may be added to protest the action of the State convention, please feel free to call on me."

From Sparta:

"Though the whole State blushes, you may be comforted in the knowledge that the whole State is behind you. Your fine service to the Nation won you the respect and admiration of all."

From Milwaukee:

"It was with a feeling of tremendous regret that I read this morning of the shameful handling you received at the State GOP convention. However, it came not as a complete surprise, for I feel that action lacking good judgment can and must be expected from the State organization because of the extremely low level of the personally ambitious know-nothings who have apparently taken the reins of the State GOP. My very firm conviction is that all thinking Republicans whose vision extends beyond their personal aggrandizement, and likewise those who have the real national welfare at heart, will certainly be heard in a strong and effective voice in September when we return you to the Chambers in which you have worked tirelessly as a man of sound judgment and admirable integrity."

From Milwaukee:

"For the last several years it has been quite apparent to me that the Republican Party of Wisconsin is controlled by a collection of political crackpots. My wife and I would like to take this opportunity to inform you that despite the decision of the State convention, we back your candidacy 100 percent."

From Milwaukee:

"I feel that the recent disgraceful actions of the local Republican organization in denying you the chance for nomination certainly does not meet with the approval of all good Republicans. To say the least, your excellent record should entitle you to the opportunity to continue in your high office with the approval of those who have benefited by your long service at Washington."

From Fond du Lac:

"I am sure that I am expressing the sentiments of many Wisconsin citizens when I say that we are not in agreement with the action taken at the State convention. It is with great satisfaction to hear that you will let the people decide as to whom they wish to have represent them in the United States Senate. We appreciate very much the great efforts put forth by you during the time while you have so ably represented our cause in Washington. Do not hesitate to let us know if and when we can be of service in connection with the coming election, or any other matter where our help would be needed."

From Milwaukee:

"As a Wisconsin Republican, I was more than a little disgusted with the results of the recent State convention. You are assured of my vote in the fall primary, Senator."

From Milwaukee:

"Just a note to say I think the treatment given you at the State convention was shameful. I will have a chance to show how I feel in the primary, as will thousands of other Wisconsin voters. There seems to be no organization more stupid than the Republican State organization."

From Milwaukee:

"What has happened this weekend in Wisconsin was a disgrace to our State's politics, a few Wisconsin men railroaded their plans through the State Republican convention."

"I am writing as a Milwaukee independent who usually votes Democratic and who has followed your leadership in international defense for the last several years. You have

been the only Wisconsin Senator who has understood what we face in our danger from Russian imperialism; and you have furthered our State's interests through your defense of the St. Lawrence seaway bill. * * * Your setback this weekend will further your interests more than any indorsement by the isolationist holdovers and pseudo-king-makers of our State, who don't realize that the times have changed. * * * Please excuse the typing, but I have been upset all day about this."

From Watertown:

"We were much disappointed by the action taken by the convention in Milwaukee yesterday. I assume that a phase of isolationism is responsible for the action taken. I think your stand on foreign aid is fundamentally sound. It is Christian. I think if you hammer home that truth you can get the necessary support. The sentiment for foreign aid is not as vocal as that opposed to it."

From Madison:

"I was extremely disappointed at the action of the convention last Saturday. I will give you my unqualified support. If you will send me some of your nomination papers I will take care of them."

From Milwaukee:

"I wish at this time to offer my services to you in furtherance of your candidacy in the coming senatorial campaign. I am in fundamental agreement with your position and wish to help further the same. * * * My experience in the conduct of political campaigns is extremely limited; however, my background is such that I feel I may be of some benefit and assistance."

From Mosinee:

"There is every evidence that certain people within the Republican Party are now looking for trouble. I say this advisedly. A house divided against itself cannot exist. I had the privilege to cast my first ballot in the year 1915. Never before have I witnessed such intraparty chicanery."

From Waunakee:

"As an independent voter I have much admired your stand on many of the basic issues before the Nation and I have been equally disgusted with the shabby treatment given you by the regular Republican organization of Wisconsin. Dozens of my friends, Republican, Democrat, and Independent in view feel the same way. You will receive warm support in your campaign."

From Marinette:

"In view of the fact that you will have to combat \$150,000 worth of reactionary propaganda, we are enclosing a small check to help neutralize it."

From Waukesha:

"I would like to assure you at this time that a great many of us heartily disapprove of tactics of this nature, and I wanted to offer my assistance in any way which might be helpful in the coming primary. * * * I sincerely appreciate all that you did for me in 1953 when I requested your assistance and will be only too happy to take this opportunity if you see fit to be of any service to you that might be helpful or beneficial to you in your coming campaign."

From a Wisconsin citizen in Bloomington, Ill.:

"Needless to say I am not at all in sympathy with the manner in which this convention paid its respects to its senior Senator from Wisconsin. I am also certain that the Wisconsin voters will indicate their dislike of this entire matter when next they come to the polls for the primary election. * * * When one has devoted so much of his life as a public servant and has done the very best in a Christian and honest manner as you have done for the people of Wisconsin, one must indeed have the patience of the Good Lord Himself to sum up enough courage and turn the other cheek."

From Madison:

"After what the Republicans did at their convention though I actually believe I have become convinced that I will become a Democrat. I say this in all seriousness because I know I could never get along with a bunch of hypocrites who pay lip service to the President and then proceed to pull their support from a man who has backed the President over 90 percent of the time."

From Platteville:

"The manipulations of certain of the alleged leaders of the Republican Party in Wisconsin, plus the underwriting of huge subscriptions to the party, are examples of incidents which lead to the charges of bossism."

From Clintonville:

"It was not only you but Eisenhower and what we believe to be the best leaders of the Republican Party. That the blow fell on you brings the question out into the open to the people of Wisconsin and the Nation because your record as a Christian, a citizen and a statesman is inviolable. This really puts you in place to use your viking courage, your fearless but your fair leadership. You are fighting for the very sacred principles of our way of life, and I pray and hope that your health will enable you to face the problem for the good of your State, your party, and your Nation. * * * I have never in any political experience seen such a reaction against the party and in your favor as is going around me everywhere."

From Fond du Lac:

"I was very much perturbed about the manner in which you were treated at Milwaukee, but if it has made other people in Wisconsin as mad as it made me, you will have gained plenty. I am glad our group from Fond du Lac stuck with you."

From Port Washington:

"It was again my pleasure to circulate your nomination blank which is enclosed herewith."

"Your record at Washington speaks for itself, and I am sure, come election day, the results will be most favorable for you."

"Keep up the good work."

From Hurley:

"I am herewith enclosing your nomination paper properly filled out, and wish you all the luck in the world."

"It was a dirty trick to pass you up at the convention and feel confident you will come through on top, and whatever I can do for you I surely will."

From Sheboygan:

"My husband and I have been Republicans all our lives. To say we were utterly disgusted with the treatment you received in Milwaukee yesterday is putting it mildly."

"We and most of our relatives and friends in Sheboygan are for you and your policies wholeheartedly. Hence we are proud of your determination to let the people decide this fall."

From Milwaukee:

"Sorry about the insult you experienced in Milwaukee. We have a lot of stupid, ill-mannered, unappreciative, dumb louts. However, it has reacted to your benefit. Of 100 people I have talked to over 90 percent said they were for WILEY and some stated it riled them to read of your experience and darned if they wouldn't work for you and snow under the numbskulls. Many said WILEY will get back 4 to 1 or better. * * * Keep up the good work."

From Madison:

"Please send me about a dozen nomination sheets, for distribution among independents who are anxious to circulate them. I will see that they get back."

From Milwaukee:

"As you yourself have stated, the people will judge and make the final decision. I was very glad to know that you are going to run for nomination on your own without support of the organization. This great

country of ours has been founded and its progress has been sponsored by men like yourself who down through the years have opposed machine and boss politics.

"I shall request and urgently ask my friends to support you in the coming primary election."

From South Wayne:

"I am gratified that you had the courage to declare you would enter the State primary even though the State Republican convention did not endorse you. This should show folks who appreciate deeds more than words that the people in control of the party machinery have some selfish ideas. How can they pretend to support President Eisenhower and yet repudiate their representative in the Senate who has supported the President's policies—especially the foreign policy?"

"You are in a position to understand its problems more than anyone else, especially one with no experience."

From Winneconne:

"You are doing a good job for us folks from Wisconsin, and for the Nation in general, and feel sure that you will weather the storm and receive a good vote in the primary."

From Kenosha:

"We are very disturbed about the result of the convention at Milwaukee last week. However, we did note that the Kenosha delegation did vote for your renomination."

"May we wish you good luck on your endeavors for gaining the nomination in the primary."

From Fort Atkinson:

"It almost makes me cry when I think of how you must feel—knowing you have done a hard job so well and realizing the little that matters to 'them'—all they care about is obtaining anyone who is more inclined to their ways. It's absolutely disgraceful and more."

"Perhaps you might like to know that there are citizens of Wisconsin—and the Nation, I would venture, who are outraged by all this—and intend to show our opinions in September—by voting for you, sir—a proven man and worker for what you feel is right and best."

From Milwaukee:

"The weakness of the Wisconsin Republican Party organization is evidenced in the treatment they accorded you and the things you have worked for at their recent gathering."

"With many other people in this area, I look forward to your name on the ballot in September."

From West De Pere:

"I feel compelled, nevertheless, as one of your constituents, to express my personal appreciation for your 18 years of loyal and honorable public service. Because of our divergent political philosophies, I have not often been in accord with your voting record. I believe, however, that you respect my right to that difference of opinion in the same way that I respect yours."

"On the other hand, all thinking Americans must recognize integrity and sincerity of purpose in our public officers, regardless of party. Your recent rebuff by your own political party was, in my humble opinion, unwarranted, undignified, and a discredit to our State. Your record of conscientious fulfillment of duty for 14 years in the party of opposition and your tenacious support of the President during the past 4 years of Republican administration, certainly merit for you now the right to carry the Republican banner in the senatorial election this year."

From Racine:

"Your display of independence will be attractive to Wisconsin voters who on past occasions have shown disrespect for labels—political convention recommendations—the kingmakers and their sycophants. The turmoil into which the Milwaukee convention descended will be a factor in your favor and success."

From Waukesha:

"It was a shame the way they treated you at Milwaukee last Saturday, however, it may yet work out satisfactorily. There are a number of us who do not like it and I feel sure that you will get considerable support."

From Hudson:

"We wish to again assure you that we are behind you 100 percent and will do everything possible to get you reelected to the job that you deserve. My phone has been ringing and people have been stopping by to find out what happened."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, let me say to the senior Senator from Wisconsin that I think in all fairness he should apologize to the man whose integrity he has just impugned. The Senator's opponent is a very distinguished Member of the House of Representatives. I think the senior Senator from Wisconsin should not, by innuendo, create the impression that there is something wrong with the fact that his opponent obtained some campaign funds. Every man who runs for office must have campaign funds. There is no evidence whatsoever—absolutely none—that a fund of \$150,000 was pledged. The senior Senator from Wisconsin knows that to be so. Moreover, there is not the slightest evidence to support the charge about oil and gas interests. Under the circumstances, these charges must be put down as irresponsible.

In all fairness to a Member of the House of Representatives, even though he happens to be the opponent of the senior Senator from Wisconsin, I think the senior Senator should apologize to him. I think the senior Senator from Wisconsin should tell the Senate that he has no evidence of any kind, shape, or form as to where his opponent's campaign funds will come from. The senior Senator from Wisconsin could tell us where his own campaign funds will come from; he knows that. But the senior Senator from Wisconsin does not know where GLENN DAVIS' campaign funds come from.

GLENN DAVIS is one of the most honorable gentlemen I know. In the past I have seen the reports regarding his campaign contributions. They compare more than favorably with those of my senior colleague; and I think it is shoddy and unusual for him to use the floor of the Senate to attack his opponent without any proof whatsoever. I think he should apologize to Mr. DAVIS now, on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am sorry the junior Senator from Wisconsin has exposed his hand so clearly.

Mr. McCARTHY. My hand has always been exposed; there is nothing secret about where I stand.

Mr. WILEY. When the junior Senator from Wisconsin starts to talk about apologies, I think there is one who should apologize, and it is he.

Mr. President, what did I say? For one thing, I said what is common knowledge, and is not denied—namely, that these three kingmakers guaranteed a fund; and it was stated by Mr. Dalton, who is the agent of my opponent. I said I did not know where the money would come from. But I think it would be well to find out.

I have asked what changed the attitude of the man who previously told the people of the State he would not become a candidate. Was it the pledge of \$150,000? Was it? Let us find out. He alone can tell us. If the money is clean, if it does not create any obligation to follow what others think, it is not for me to complain.

I am only saying that if a contribution of \$2,500 can create the stir which it did on the floor of the Senate, I think we ought to give a little heed when tactics are such that a person proceeds along a certain line, indicating that he will not be a candidate, and then changes his course when a pledge of \$150,000 decides the question. Let us get the answer. When it is forthcoming, I shall be glad to see it.

I do not like the attitude of the junior Senator from Wisconsin in trying to tell me what I should do. In all the years when the opportunities were multitudinous, I never tried to tell him what he should do. Until now he has gone about his business and I have gone about mine. But now he is meddling in my business.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, let me say to my colleague that it was not four "kingmakers" who repudiated him. It was the rank and file of the Republican Party. I forget the number. The Senator probably remembers it better than I do. It was some 1,700 representatives of the rank and file of the Republican Party who repudiated him. There are no "kingmakers" in Wisconsin. The charge of my colleague that \$150,000 was raised is completely false. He knows that. He should not make such a charge. We should not have that type of campaign in Wisconsin.

My senior colleague has a very honorable opponent. The voters of Wisconsin may select my senior colleague. They may select Mr. DAVIS. As I told my senior colleague, I intend to make no public speeches in the primary campaign. If he gets the nomination, and if he wants my support, I will support the Republican candidate. I say "if he wants my support." But let us not throw around wild and completely irresponsible charges about \$150,000 and about oil and gas interests. Let us not try to create the impression that it was the "kingmakers" who repudiated my senior colleague. It was the rank and file of the Republican Party of Wisconsin who decided that he had not been a good Senator, and that they did not want him to serve them in the future. They so voted.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the primary the people will decide whether or not the junior Senator from Wisconsin knows what he is talking about. There is every indication that he is as biased in this case as he is in many other cases. When he talks about knowing what the future will hold, he goes into a class where he does not belong.

The night before the convention there were pledged to the senior Senator from Wisconsin enough votes to nominate him on the first ballot. The rules were rigged. On Friday I was to be voted upon first. The rules were rigged, so

that I was not voted upon until late Saturday. According to the program, I was to be voted upon first. The manipulators sat up until 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning to do the job. The result was that the man who would not be a candidate was chosen. Why would he not become a candidate? Ask some of his associates. The \$150,000 had not yet been pledged, when he stated he would not be a candidate. But it was pledged Saturday morning. It did the job. The Journal got the story and published it. The Journal is one of the great newspapers of America, in spite of what the junior Senator from Wisconsin says. A large percentage of it is owned by the employees. The Senator's abuse cannot hurt it.

I never took the opportunity on the floor of the Senate to talk about my associate as he has talked about me. Something seems to have gotten under his skin. The facts will show in the future what got under his skin.

Mr. McCARTHY subsequently said:

Mr. President, although I have not been able to verify it, I have just been informed that Representative DAVIS, who was accused of receiving oil and gas money, voted against the natural gas bill. I personally voted for it. I thought it was a good bill. But I think—since the charge has been made, by innuendo, that Representative DAVIS received oil and gas funds—that the RECORD should be clear that Mr. DAVIS voted against the gas bill. As I have said, I have not been able to verify this information. I have just received a call from the House to that effect.

SALE OF INHERITED INTERESTS IN ALLOTTED LANDS IN THE TULALIP RESERVATION, WASH.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3920) to authorize the partition or sale of inherited interests in allotted lands in the Tulalip Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words with respect to the legislation now pending before the Senate, S. 3920. I introduced this bill at the request of the Tulalip Tribes of Indians in the State of Washington.

The Indians on this reservation have recently been approached by a major oil company which desires to build a large refinery on the reservation lands. It is an excellent opportunity for the Indians in the community to derive tremendous economic benefits, and there is unanimity on the part of the membership of the tribes in attempting to make it possible for this refinery to be built.

There is one great difficulty which must first be overcome before the reservations lands can be utilized properly. As in the case of most reservations, the Tulalip Tribes have a very complex heirship land problem; that is, the lands on the reservation were allotted years ago and have since passed into multiple ownership. More than 15,000 acres out of a total of almost 18,000 acres on the reservation are in this fractionated status. If the lands are to be utilized at all, a legislative solution for this heir-

ship problem must be found, and it is the opinion of the Indians, the Department of the Interior, and myself, that the language of S. 3920 will clarify the situation.

Briefly, Mr. President, this bill has two purposes. First, to permit any owner of an undivided interest in any trust or restricted lands on the Tulalip Reservation to go into the courts of the State of Washington and request that the land be partitioned, or if this is impractical, have it sold in accordance with State law. Second, it authorizes the tribal board of directors to sell tribal lands with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior.

The objective of the tribe under this legislation is to consolidate the lands of the reservation by buying up the individual tracts as they are sold under the laws of the State. In this way the tribe will be able to offer the oil company a suitable site for its refinery with the necessary access to deep water.

Mr. President, I want the record to show that the Indians on the Tulalip Reservation are a well-integrated group of citizens, and are recognized as being competent to administer their own affairs. They have adopted a resolution which is contained in the Senate report on S. 3920 requesting that I introduce this bill for them. They are desirous that the legislation be passed so that the proper steps may be taken to bring this important economic asset into their community. The fact that these people are trying to help themselves individually and collectively is highly commendable, and the passage of this bill would be of great assistance to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3920) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any owner of an interest in any tract of land in the Tulalip Reservation, Wash., in which any undivided interest is now or hereafter held in trust by the United States for an Indian, or is now or hereafter owned by an Indian subject to restrictions against alienation or taxation imposed by the United States, may commence in a State court of competent jurisdiction an action for the partition in kind or for the sale of such land in accordance with the laws of the State. For the purpose of any such action the Indian owners shall be regarded as vested with an unrestricted fee simple title to the land, the United States shall not be a necessary party to the proceeding, and any partition or conveyance of the land pursuant to the proceeding shall divest the United States of title to the land, terminate the Federal trust, and terminate all restrictions against alienation or taxation of the land imposed by the United States.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of the constitution and charter of the Tulalip Tribes of the Tulalip Reservation, any lands that are held by the United States in trust for the Tulalip Tribes, or that are subject to a restriction against alienation or taxation imposed by the United States, or that are hereafter acquired by the Tulalip Tribes, may be sold by the Tulalip Board of Directors, with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior, on such terms and conditions as the Tulalip Board of Directors may prescribe, and such sale shall terminate the Federal trust or re-

strictions against alienation or taxation of the land: *Provided*, That the proceeds from the sale of any tribal lands acquired otherwise than by purchase shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Tulalip Tribes and shall not be expended until otherwise specifically provided by Congress.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9390) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 10, 16, 27, 28, and 35 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18 to the bill, and agreed to the same with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10899) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PRESTON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. YATES, Mr. SHELLEY, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CLEVINGER, Mr. BOW, Mr. HORAN, Mr. MILLER of Maryland, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 1671. An act for the relief of Clement E. Sprouse;

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Elizabeth Doherty;

H. R. 2216. An act to amend the act of June 19, 1948 (ch. 511, 62 Stat. 489), relating to the retention in the service of disabled commissioned officers and warrant officers of the Army and Air Force;

H. R. 3996. An act to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945;

H. R. 4229. An act to provide running mates for certain staff corps officers in the naval service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4437. An act relating to withholding for State employee retirement system purposes, on the compensation of certain civilian employees of the National Guard and the Air National Guard;

H. R. 4569. An act to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes;

H. R. 4704. An act to provide for the examination preliminary to promotion of officers of the naval service;

H. R. 5268. An act to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the payment of mileage allowances for overland travel by private conveyance

outside the continental limits of the United States;

H. R. 7679. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the city of Muskogee, Okla.;

H. R. 8477. An act to amend title II of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, by providing flexibility in the distribution of women officers in the grades of commander and lieutenant commander, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8490. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Bonham, Tex.;

H. R. 8674. An act to provide for the return of certain property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.;

H. R. 9358. An act to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to issue a deed to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for certain land heretofore conveyed to such city, removing the conditions and reservations made a part of such prior conveyance; and

H. R. 10251. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to deed certain land to the city of Grand Junction, Colo.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITION OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE PIPESTONE NATIONAL MONUMENT, MINN.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2060, House bill 8225.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8225) to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Pipestone National Monument in the State of Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, H. R. 8225, if enacted, would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to add to the Pipestone National Monument, Minn., not more than 250 acres of adjacent Federal land, as the Secretary deems necessary to protect archeological remains, and to acquire not more than 10 acres of non-Federal land as he considers necessary to improve the boundary of the monument.

No appropriation of Federal funds is authorized by this legislation.

The Pipestone National Monument, created by the act of August 25, 1937 (50 Stat. 804), covers an area of 115.86 acres. The Federal land which would be added by H. R. 8225 contains important remains of the red pipestone quarry which served as a source of stone of unique properties from which many tribes of North American Indians fashioned their pipes. This land is part of the Pipestone school reserve, consisting of a tract of

532 acres of land, which has been abandoned and is surplus to the needs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The committee notes that the city of Pipestone, Minn., is interested in acquiring that portion of the tract that is not added to the monument. Therefore, it is the intent of the Federal agencies to dispose of such lands in accordance with surplus-property procedures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TROUT HATCHERY ON THE DAVIDSON RIVER, N. C.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2061, H. R. 9822.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9822) to provide for the establishment of a trout hatchery on the Davidson River in Pisgah National Forest in North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to offer an amendment to the bill. I am very glad, indeed, that the people of North Carolina are about to have a new fish hatchery established in Pisgah National Forest. In my State the fish hatchery which serves the Green Mountain National Forest is in need of reconstruction, equipment, and so forth, over a period of years. The appropriation for this year was \$32,000.

It seems to me that equal consideration should be given to the needs of the Green Mountain National Forest as compared with the Pisgah National Forest. Therefore, I offer an amendment to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The secretary will state the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May I inquire whether the Senator from Vermont has submitted his amendment to the committee?

Mr. FLANDERS. No; I heard of this matter for the first time today. Year after year hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent on brandnew fish hatcheries, while at the same time a paltry \$25,000 or \$30,000 a year is appropriated for the fish hatchery in the Green Mountain National Forest, which is a program that has already been adopted by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not wish to disagree with the Senator from Vermont that Vermont has not been equitably treated, because I am not informed on that point. However, I believe that the amendment the Senator has in mind should follow the orderly procedure by being submitted first to the committee. If the Senator from Ver-

mont insists on offering his amendment at this time, the majority leader is not in a position to accept it, because the author of the pending bill, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], is not on the floor, and the chairman of the committee has not held hearings on the Senator's amendment. If the Senator insists on his amendment, the majority leader will request that the Senate proceed to the consideration of some other bill.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to say to the Senator from Texas that I had assumed right along that the regular appropriation bill carried appropriations for the building and improvement of Federal fish hatcheries in the national forests and in other places. Nevertheless, from time to time bills providing special appropriations are introduced and considered. I feel it to be my duty to my constituents that I try to get the same treatment for Vermont.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I believe the Senator should try to do so; but he should follow the course pursued by the Senator from North Carolina, in having his bill referred to the appropriate committee and asking that the committee give it consideration and then having the committee report the bill to the Senate. If the Senator from Vermont were to follow that procedure, the Senator from Texas would be very glad to join him in urging the committee to give consideration to his bill.

The Senator from Texas does not wish to defeat the bill of the Senator from North Carolina by injecting into its consideration a matter which has not had consideration by the committee. If the Senator from Vermont insists on offering his amendment, the majority leader will ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of another measure.

The Senator from Texas would like to see the Senator from Vermont introduce his bill in the regular order; and the Senator from Texas will join him in asking the committee to give him a hearing on the bill. The Senator from Texas has no doubt that the committee will consider the needs of the State of Vermont as presented to it by the Senator from Vermont, who so ably represents it, in part.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, there are two comments which I should like to make on what the Senator from Texas has said. The first is that I have not the slightest animus toward the people of North Carolina; in fact, I have feelings of deep friendliness toward them and toward its representatives in the Senate. I do not wish to do anything which would in any way jeopardize what they have in mind and what they are asking for. That is one-half of the problem.

The second half of the problem is the question—and this is parliamentary—whether such a bill can be introduced in the Senate. Must not such a bill be introduced in the House?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Oh no; the Senator may introduce such a bill in the Senate. It is purely an authorization bill.

Mr. FLANDERS. It is purely an authorization bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct. The distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is a member of the committee that would consider such a bill. If the Senator from Vermont introduces such a bill, the Senator from Texas will ask the committee to give it consideration and to make a report on it to the Senate during this session of Congress.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, in view of my friendship toward the people of North Carolina and the Senators who represent that State in the Senate, and because of the very wise observations of the Senator from Texas, instead of trying to amend the pending bill, I shall submit my amendment to the Senate in the form of a separate bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate the Senator's cooperation, and I assure him of mine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 9822) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2058, H. R. 3255.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3255) to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to preserve the rates of compensation of certain officers and employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to preserve the basic compensation of certain officers and employees whose rates of pay are fixed under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, whose positions have been or may be reduced to a lower grade by virtue of a reclassification action.

The Classification Act of 1949, as amended, authorizes the departments and agencies to allocate positions to appropriate grades in accordance with standards published by the Civil Service Commission. Such initial allocations are subject to review and confirmation by the Civil Service Commission. When the Commission dissents with the allocation of one or more positions it has the authority to order the allocation changed.

There have been instances where agency allocations have stood as initially established for several years and upon the second or third audit by the Commission were ordered reduced to a lower grade. In other instances, initial agency allocations were not audited for a period of several years. In still other instances, the agencies on their own volition reclassified positions to a lower grade. In any event, the downgrading of a position and resultant loss of pay to an employee who is but the victim of circumstances

over which he has no control and for which he is in nowise responsible is highly demoralizing and most inequitable.

The Civil Service Commission in its report of June 13, 1955, on H. R. 3255, as introduced, raised a number of questions regarding the wording of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina subsequently said:

Mr. President, I have a statement in connection with Calendar No. 2058, House bill 3255, to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to preserve the rates of compensation of certain officers and employees, which explains the bill, and I should like to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

H. R. 3255 amends title V of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, by adding at the end thereof subsection 507 which is designed to preserve the basic compensation of employees whose positions have been downgraded since July 1, 1954, or may be downgraded in the future by virtue of a reclassification action.

The fixing of pay rates for positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is done by the agencies on the basis of standards promulgated by the Civil Service Commission. The Civil Service Commission has the responsibility for making post audits of the rates established by the agencies which frequently results in a downgrading of the positions. It is not uncommon for the downgrading to occur 4 or 5 or more years after the rate of pay was established by the agency. The result is that the individuals filling the downgraded positions become the unfortunate victims of factors beyond their control. The resultant loss of pay to employees who may have made long-range financial commitments based on a rate of pay they had every reason to believe would continue in effect is of serious consequence.

Extensive hearings were held on the bill in the House July 11 and 26, 1955, during which there was general agreement by the Civil Service Commission and employee organizations as to the need for corrective action. As a matter of fact, the Commission attempted to fulfill the objectives of H. R. 3255 by administrative regulation but the Comptroller General ruled on October 31, 1955, that it was without legal authority to do so. Accordingly, there is need for legislation as embodied in H. R. 3255.

It is to be noted:

First, that the bill does not apply to the supergrade positions.

Second, that the bill applies only to career employees.

Third, that an employee must have held the position being downgraded for a period of at least 2 years and performed the duties of the position in a satisfactory manner.

Fourth, that the bill will give no employee retroactive pay.

Fifth, that employee whose rate of pay is preserved will receive no further increases until protection of his salary is no longer required.

These are all good provisions and will serve to make the bill workable and equitable for both the Government and its employees.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR; HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE; AND RELATED AGENCIES, 1957

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2116, House bill 9720, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor; Health, Education, and Welfare; and related agencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9720) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor; Health, Education, and Welfare; and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is not planned that the Senate shall discuss the bill today, because it has not been before the Senate the necessary 3 days under the rule. We plan to have the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] call it up tomorrow.

GLORIA LOCKERMAN

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, during the past few months a little 12-year-old girl from Baltimore, Md., named Gloria Lockerman, has captured the respect and admiration of millions of Americans. Frankly, I consider her one of the best goodwill ambassadors Maryland has produced in years.

Gloria has been able to do all of this by the way in which she has conducted herself during her numerous appearances on two nationally televised shows entitled "The \$64,000 Question" and "The \$64,000 Challenge."

Some months ago, in the \$64,000 question show, she won her championship in spelling, and incidentally, as I recall, some \$8,000. More recently, on the \$64,000 Challenge show, she has been pitted against another 12-year-old spelling wizard from Greenwich, Conn., named Andrew Douglass.

These two young experts in the fine, old, and, I am sorry to say, disappearing art of spelling week after week have spelled correctly every multisyllable word tossed at them. In fact they deadlocked by reason of each having spelled correctly the words which were given to them at the \$64,000 plateau.

And so, last night Gloria and Andy were each given checks for \$32,000 and the contest was declared a draw. However, it was obvious to those of us who watched the performance that, in a sense, Gloria was disappointed that the sponsors did not permit the match to go on. In fact when asked whether or not she was pleased with the decision to declare the match a draw, and to give each contestant \$32,000, she said, "I do not know, I have been studying so hard."

Accordingly, I should like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to this young lady, not only for her spelling proficiency but, equally important, for the well-demeaned way in which she conducted herself at all times; and last but not least for her courage and humble, but firm, confidence in herself. In particular, to my distinguished colleagues from the fine State of Connecticut, I should like to say that while it is very clear that Connecticut turns out excellent spellers, too, thanks to Miss Lockerman, the Nation recognizes that the championship still resides in Baltimore, Md.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of an editorial which appeared in the May 5 issue of the Afro-American concerning Miss Lockerman entitled "And Still Champion."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AND STILL CHAMPION

Gloria Lockerman's appearance on the \$64,000 Challenge television program last Sunday served to further endear her to millions of fans over the country.

Perhaps because of her challenger's extremely confident (is "cocky" the word?) attitude, the spelling queen of the airwaves seemed quite nervous.

We hope Gloria bears in mind that she doesn't have to deal with the challenger to win—all she has to do is spell the words—and her past performances have proven her ability to do this.

Win, lose or draw, Gloria will in reality still be the champ.

Why? Because she's a healthy, well-rounded girl with excellent spelling ability—not a professional prodigy who reads books on history and political science rather than comic books.

ANTITRUST RECORD OF EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared on the antitrust record of the Eisenhower administration.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER PERTAINING TO THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION'S ANTITRUST RECORD

Antitrust aims to promote free competition in open markets. This policy is a prime tenet of free enterprise. Thus, opportunity for market access and fostering of market rivalry are crucial to our faith in competition as a form of economic organization.

So it is that most Americans have a vital stake in effective antitrust enforcement. For antitrust has become a distinctly American means for assuring that competitive economy on which our political and social freedom in part depend. These laws have helped release energies essential to our world leadership, industrial productivity, and technological growth. They reinforce our ideal of careers open to superior skills and talent, a crucial norm of a free society. As a result, the essentials of antitrust stand proclaimed by both political parties.

General agreement on antitrust goals, let me caution, must not obscure important differences in means. Here this administration parts company with its immediate predecessors

on at least three scores. First, cases brought have aimed not at mere doctrinal perambulations but at making real strides either toward cracking restraints on entry or controls over price. Thus, this administration's goal has been a vigorous cracking down, without fear or favor, on hard-core antitrust violations. Second, because businessmen know this difference in policy will spell greater court success, pretrial settlements have jumped sharply. Thus, this administration secures more results for each enforcement dollar. Finally, in these foggy unsettled reaches of law and policy, we have not sought a hasty certainty at the cost of careful deliberation. A study group, representing a fair cross section of all antitrust views, has surveyed major decisions under the Sherman and Clayton Acts and thus helped our Nation mold a coherent antitrust policy.

Recent Antitrust Division activities highlight these three differences. For the year ending December 31, 1955, for example, 54 new cases were filed—33 civil and 21 criminal. These 54 new cases represent a sharp increase over the recent past. Thus, in fiscal year 1952, the last year of the previous administration, 30 new cases were filed; in fiscal year 1953, 33 new proceedings were brought; and in fiscal 1954, some 32 new antitrust causes were launched. The bulk of these 54 new cases, I point out, involved traditional hard-core Sherman Act violations such as price fixing and allocation of territories.

Beyond these 54 new cases, during the same period, January 1, 1955, through December 31, 1955, some 52 antitrust cases were brought to a close. Of these 52, 14 of the cases closed were cases filed during that very year. Thus, this administration makes real strides toward keeping calendars up to date.

Ability to close these 14 cases in the same year they were brought stems in some measure from this administration's new program for pre-filing negotiation. In essence, our approach involves negotiation of consent judgments prior to the filing of the civil complaint. By holding up formal proceedings, we aim to avoid freezing either Government or defendants' attitudes into publicly expressed positions. Thus, we hope to promote flexibility and ease compromise in the process of decree negotiation.

Pre-filing negotiation itself is no stranger to the Department of Justice. In the second half of the 1920's about a quarter of all cases utilized this procedure. In the 1930's, however, such negotiation fell into disuse. And when it was revived, from 1939 through 1942, it was pressed after companion criminal cases had been brought. Thus, pre-filing civil negotiations were then only a step in the settlement of the criminal proceedings. And this pressure of the pending criminal suit on civil settlement negotiation (whether actual or inferred) was generally criticized.

From this pressure policy, this administration's current pre-filing negotiation practice differs sharply. Today, the Department of Justice enters pre-filing negotiations only where civil proceedings are contemplated. Thus, in no instance is the criminal sanction used to coerce civil settlement. The purpose is to adjust civil controversies before they come to court, not to force their disposal by threat of criminal prosecution.

In addition to concentration on hard-core violations and increased emphasis on calendar cleanups, cases brought have aimed at practical enforcement results, at vigorous enforcement without fear or favor. Such enforcement results, I point out, this administration has pressed for against all groups alike. For example, Congress has exempted many activities of organized labor from antitrust. Nonetheless, this administration has moved vigorously to strike down those union

restraints on commercial competition which Congress has not specifically shielded. From January 1953 to date the division has brought 10 cases in which a union was a defendant and 1 in which a union was a coconspirator. This 3-year record of 11 cases stands in sharp contrast with the 6-year record from 1946 to 1953 of only 16 cases naming unions as defendants. Thus, in a little over 2 years this administration has brought virtually 75 percent as many cases against unions as were brought in the 6 years before 1952.

Not only are all violators, no matter what their political power, brought to bar, but once judgments are rendered, this administration sees to it that they are lived up to. In the 62 years since the Sherman Act's passage, some 24 contempt proceedings have been brought for violation of outstanding decrees. Of this 24, one-third, or 8, have been brought in the past 3 years since the Republican administration took over in Washington.

In sum, then, this administration has made real strides toward effective antitrust enforcement. At the heart of our antitrust laws are the highest intellectual and moral principles. These concepts, based on a firm and definite national policy, a bipartisan article of faith, have endured with variations only in emphasis for more than a century. This national policy, this national belief, is not stationary nor static. That policy today remains vital and vigorous. It underscores Americans' fundamental belief that a dynamic republic can rest only upon the foundation of a free economy, and that economic freedom, like political liberty, belongs only to those who are vigilant to preserve it.

CONSTRUCTION OF MODERN GREAT LAKES BULK CARGO VESSELS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce the possibility of getting a unanimous-consent agreement in connection with Calendar No. 1896, Senate bill 3108, to encourage the construction of modern Great Lakes bulk cargo vessels. If an agreement could be reached to vote on that bill with an hour's limitation of time, 30 minutes to each side, it would be the disposition of the leadership to sandwich it in sometime tomorrow.

The distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has agreed to contact the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and if they can work out an agreement, I should like the Senate to be on notice that there is a possibility of the bill being considered tomorrow. If it is considered, I am informed that it will be necessary to have a quorum and yea-and-nay vote on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there are no other Senators who desire recognition, I move that, pursuant to the order previously entered, the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 5, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 4, 1956:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Edward Page, Jr., of the District of Columbia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Henry H. Ford, of Florida.
Frederick C. Oechsner, of Louisiana.
Robert P. Chalker, of Florida, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Ralph J. Burton, of Illinois.
Basil Capella, of Maryland.
Loren Carroll, of Illinois.
Arch K. Jean, of Pennsylvania.
Arthur G. Jones, of Virginia.
Robert N. Magill, of Maryland.
George H. Owen, of New York.
David H. Popper, of New York.
Walter A. Radius, of Virginia.
Donovan Q. Zook, of Ohio.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Kenneth W. Calloway, of Illinois.
Mary Mulloy Carmichael, of Montana.
Daniel H. Clare, Jr., of Virginia.
Robert A. Conrads, of the District of Columbia.

William E. Fee, Jr., of New York.
Bernard J. Humes, of Virginia.
Albert E. Irving, of Maryland.
Robert H. Kranich, of Maryland.
Richard S. Leach, of Connecticut.
Albert P. Maylo, of Michigan.
George T. Moody, of Maryland.
George S. Newman, of New York.
George A. Pope, of Idaho.
Ralph Scarritt, of Illinois.
Leslie C. Tihany, of Illinois.
Harold N. Waddell, of Georgia.
Findley Weaver, of Oklahoma.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Edward S. Benet, of Texas.
Waldemar B. Campbell, of Washington.
John Warner Foley, Jr., of New Hampshire.
Alvaro F. Galvan, of New York.
Lawrence E. Gruza, of Connecticut.
Paul M. Kattenburg, of Virginia.
Stanley R. Kidder, of Oregon.
Oris F. Kolb, of Virginia.
Glenwood B. Matthews, of California.
Saul Moskowitz, of New York.
John P. Reddington, of New York.
Everett W. Schoening, of Illinois.
Miss Eulalia L. Wall, of Texas.
Robert L. Ware, Jr., of New Jersey.
Samuel H. Young, of Florida.
George R. Phelan, Jr., of Missouri, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Charles W. Brown, of California.
Edward H. Brown, of Pennsylvania.
Joseph F. Christiano, of New York.

Thomas W. Fina, of Florida.
Wayne R. Gilchrist, of Missouri.
Walter T. Kamprad, of California.
George R. Kaplan, of Massachusetts.
Earl A. Kessler II, of Oregon.
Mrs. Elvira L. Lawyer, of the District of Columbia.

Miss Margaret McDonald, of South Dakota.
Miss Alice C. Mahoney, of Arizona.
Miss Colette Meyer, of California.
Miss Helen J. Mullen, of New York.
John G. Panos, of Illinois.
Miss Wilma C. Patterson, of Indiana.
Edward M. Peach, of Virginia.
Miss M. Adelaide Roberts, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Margaret A. Stanturf, of Missouri.
Robert G. Sturgill, of Utah.
Abraham Vigil, of Colorado.
Daroslav S. Vlahovich, of New Jersey.
Henry C. Wechsler, of Ohio.
Miss Hertha C. Wegener, of New York.
Mrs. Margaret P. A. Welsh, of Louisiana.
Miss Helen B. Wilson, of California.
Miss Jane B. Young, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Thomas A. Bartlett, of Oregon.
Carlton C. Brower, of California.
Davis S. Chamberlain, of New Jersey.
Edward M. Cohen, of New York.
John G. Dean, of New York.
Miss Sharon E. Erdkamp, of Nebraska.
Donald C. Ferguson, of California.
Lewis P. Fickett, Jr., of Maine.
Miss Catherine M. Frank, of Connecticut.
Roderick N. Grant, of California.
Charles W. Grover, of New York.
Mrs. Winifred T. Hall, of New Jersey.
Robert M. Immerman, of New York.
Donald A. Johnston, of New York.
Ernest B. Johnston, Jr., of Alabama.
Gordon A. Klett, of California.
Gerald Lamberty, of Wisconsin.
Jay H. Long, of California.
David R. McClurg, of Illinois.
Edward R. O'Connor, of New York.
Robert K. Olson, of Minnesota.
Miss Mary Hoxton Pierce, of Florida.
William B. Pounds, Jr., of Ohio.
Ernest G. Reeves, of North Carolina.
J. Harden Rose, of Illinois.
Edward M. Rowell, of California.
Miss Edith M. Scott, of the District of Columbia.
Peter Semler, of New York.
William Slany, of the District of Columbia.
John D. Tinny, of Florida.
Julius W. Walker, Jr., of Texas.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Robert W. Ades, of Oregon.
Jay Castillo, of Nevada.
Gordon P. Hagberg, of California.
James Mocer, of Washington.
Miss Barbara M. White, of Illinois.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Douglas S. Blaufarb, of Maryland.
George F. Wilson, of California.
Louis C. Bosetti, of Connecticut, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Paul Garbler, of North Carolina.
Lloyd A. Harnage, of Florida.
Robinson McIlvaine, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

William P. Boteler, of the District of Columbia.

James P. Hurley, of New York.
Theodore L. Lewis, of New York.
Jean M. Nater, of Virginia.

Richard H. Snowden, of the District of Columbia.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

James Cunningham Sargent, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1961, vice Clarence H. Adams, term expired.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Willard Frank Libby, of Illinois, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for a term of 5 years expiring June 30, 1961. (Reappointment.)

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Albert E. McCollam, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission, under the provisions of section 1 of an act of Congress, approved March 1, 1893 (27 Stat. 507; 33 U. S. C. 661), vice Col. William J. Ely.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law and regulation:

I. FOR APPOINTMENT

To be surgeon

Richard L. Haines

To be senior assistant surgeon

Norman Tarr

To be senior assistant dental surgeon

Dale E. Smith

To be senior sanitary engineer

Eugene L. Lehr

To be senior nurse officer

Louise C. Anderson

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters.

ALABAMA

Jesse E. Fain, Piedmont, Ala., in place of H. C. Sharpe, deceased.

ALASKA

Everett J. Wilde, College, Alaska, in place of C. S. Hollingsworth, resigned.
Margaret P. Bohrer, Nome, Alaska, in place of J. M. McLean, resigned.
June E. Hutchinson, Whittier, Alaska, in place of M. M. Hayes, resigned.

ARIZONA

Ethel M. Green, Gila Bend, Ariz., in place of O. A. Carter, removed.

ARKANSAS

Kermit C. Sparks, Lamar, Ark., in place of M. E. Nation, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Clarence E. Farrin, Azusa, Calif., in place of T. B. Thomson, retired.
William H. O'Neill, Rosamond, Calif., in place of H. P. Vial, resigned.
Ilah M. Odem, Silverado, Calif., in place of I. B. Donovan, resigned.

COLORADO

Minta E. Gerry, Rangely, Colo., in place of M. C. White, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

Camillo Altieri, Jr., Bantam, Conn., in place of E. M. Doyle, retired.
Frederick D. Parker, Clinton, Conn., in place of E. B. Knopf, retired.

DELAWARE

Herbert C. Whitney, Magnolia, Del., in place of R. W. Anderson, retired.

GEORGIA

James M. Cox, Whigham, Ga., in place of J. R. Kennemur, transferred.

IDAHO

Jesse O. Hiatt, Marsing, Idaho, in place of W. W. Volkmer, retired.
Martha W. Cook, Tetonla, Idaho, in place of D. J. Meikle, removed.

ILLINOIS

Otis Lutz, Waterloo, Ill., in place of H. F. Schneider, retired.

INDIANA

Billy L. Kruse, Elberfeld, Ind., in place of Minnie Richardson, retired.
John T. Stevenson, Kirklín, Ind., in place of J. G. Harding, retired.
Maurice C. Griffith, Pleasant Lake, Ind., in place of Clyde Brooks, resigned.

IOWA

Donald G. Burt, Polk City, Iowa, in place of John Blake, retired.

KANSAS

Bernice F. Harvey, Lenexa, Kans., in place of Harry Meyer, removed.
Glen L. Jenkins, Reserve, Kans., in place of Elizabeth Gillispie, retired.
Clarence M. McClelland, Studley, Kans., in place of J. R. Pratt, retired.

KENTUCKY

Kermit B. Cromwell, Clinton, Ky., in place of G. F. Hilliard, retired.
Rufus D. Higgins, Gray, Ky., in place of R. A. Bratford, removed.
Wilmer L. Boggs, London, Ky., in place of H. O. House, transferred.

MAINE

Everett A. Beal, Ellsworth Falls, Maine, in place of F. F. Quinn, resigned.

MARYLAND

Alfred C. Huffer, Jr., Boonsboro, Md., in place of John Hershberger, deceased.
Arthur F. Hightman, Brunswick, Md., in place of E. L. Gross, retired.
Edmund W. Rogers, Glen Burnie, Md., in place of H. C. Estep, deceased.
Edward C. Kaighn, Greenbelt, Md., in place of T. R. Freeman, resigned.
Stanley S. Sentman, Port Deposit, Md., in place of G. A. Hohn, retired.
Elwood J. Greenhalgh, Royal Oak, Md., in place of P. M. Pastorfield, Jr., retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Alfred E. Pineau, Westport Point, Mass., in place of A. E. Columbia, retired.

MICHIGAN

Alfreda E. Swanson, Freeland, Mich., in place of V. F. Beadle, retired.
Walter B. Steele, Muskegon, Mich., in place of S. J. Risk, retired.
Cole L. Neumann, Rochester, Mich., in place of C. F. Bushman, removed.

MINNESOTA

Carl G. Bergstrom, Cokato, Minn., in place of E. J. Larson, retired.
Wesley P. Rathvon, Deerwood, Minn., in place of G. A. Oberg, retired.
Henry Walter Malchow, Marletta, Minn., in place of O. E. Nelson, retired.
Frank W. Gurno, Redlake, Minn., in place of R. E. Lee, transferred.
Sigurd A. Bertelsen, Saint Paul, Minn., in place of A. A. Van Dyke, retired.
Albert L. Dyrdahl, Williams, Minn., in place of W. E. Charlton, deceased.

MISSISSIPPI

Alva G. Edmondson, Edwards, Miss., in place of J. M. Kendrick, resigned.
S. T. Gray, Jr., New Augusta, Miss., in place of C. A. McCoy, retired.

MISSOURI

Emmett J. Snyder, Taylor, Mo., in place of M. E. McLaughlin, resigned.

MONTANA

Charles P. Rapos, Fallon, Mont., in place of Carl Anderson, retired.

NEBRASKA

Enoch D. Long, Chappell, Nebr., in place of O. F. Stegeman, transferred.
Robert B. Shaw, Guide Rock, Nebr., in place of D. W. Crews, transferred.
Joel A. Schleiger, Overton, Nebr., in place of B. G. Worthing, retired.
Elmer R. Henkel, Ralston, Nebr., in place of E. E. Adams, retired.

NEVADA

Bernice K. Morse, Tungsten, Nev., in place of L. C. Sanford, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mary W. Britton, Westmoreland, N. H., in place of A. B. Britton, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Anita Grace King, Allenhurst, N. J., in place of G. J. Imlay, resigned.
Francis J. Klerman, Glen Ridge, N. J., in place of C. S. Tobin, retired.
Raymond F. Woolf, Kingston, N. J., in place of E. B. Brooks, retired.
Ralph F. Barra, Lake Hiawatha, N. J., in place of Sam Epstein, transferred.
Daniel M. McArdle, Passaic, N. J., in place of A. V. Gross, deceased.

NEW YORK

Mildred H. Merrell, Afton, N. Y., in place of Daniel Grant, retired.
Herman R. Sievert, Fort Hunter, N. Y., in place of M. B. Albers, retired.
Albert A. Clark, Hall, N. Y., in place of Winfield Eberhart, retired.
Ruth P. Benedict, Lewis, N. Y., in place of E. S. Marshall, retired.
William A. Maillet, Lockport, N. Y., in place of E. J. Murtaugh, retired.
John S. Volpe, Manchester, N. Y., in place of A. E. Ryan, retired.
Richard G. Gavette, Margaretville, N. Y., in place of W. R. Marks, resigned.
Celia B. Ferguson, Schuyler Lake, N. Y., in place of L. E. Weaver, resigned.
John A. Fiero, Shortsville, N. Y., in place of J. M. Sweeney, resigned.
William H. Olcott, Wurtsboro, N. Y., in place of Harry Northrup, removed.

NORTH CAROLINA

Vernon P. Fullbright, Brevard, N. C., in place of T. C. Galloway, retired.
Charles A. Brown, Effland, N. C., in place of M. E. Harris, retired.
James H. Parks, Swannanoa, N. C., in place of W. B. Stone, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Harold N. Gauthier, Williston, N. Dak., in place of G. G. Harvey, retired.

OHIO

Carlton W. Strosnider, Ansonia, Ohio, in place of P. E. Smith, deceased.
Raymond C. Harris, Eaton, Ohio, in place of C. F. Hildebolt, retired.
Harold E. Mills, Franklin, Ohio, in place of P. E. Ruppert, resigned.
Ralph G. Bostwick, North Benton, Ohio, in place of O. R. Iden, resigned.
John William Evans, Orrville, Ohio, in place of C. L. Weiser, retired.
Edgar W. Stevanus, Sugar creek, Ohio, in place of S. A. Smith, retired.

OKLAHOMA

R. C. Chastain, Clayton, Okla., in place of R. H. Maxey, transferred.

PENNSYLVANIA

Verna Mae Murphy, Drumore, Pa., in place of G. W. Smith, deceased.
Thomas R. Lostrick, Ernest, Pa., in place of L. S. Helmick, deceased.
Rachel S. Rodgers, Hokendauqua, Pa., in place of E. M. Murphy, resigned.
Irvin R. MacMullen, King of Prussia, Pa., in place of L. E. Armstrong, removed.

William H. Hunsinger, Lattimer Mines, Pa., in place of F. W. Patterson, retired.
Dolores P. Mattichak, Lopez, Pa., in place of M. E. Walsh, retired.
Steve Olen, Lyndora, Pa., in place of M. S. Karlitsky, removed.
Violet F. Nelson, Minisink Hills, Pa., in place of Charles Fralley, deceased.
Catherine M. Viola, Morgan, Pa., in place of M. T. Morganti, resigned.
Leo J. English, Oil City, Pa., in place of G. W. McElhatten, removed.
Waldo L. Dyson, Sr., Pocono Pines, Pa., in place of J. P. Johnson, retired.
Kenneth E. West, Spring House, Pa., in place of F. S. Margargal, retired.
Paul E. Ness, Yoe, Pa., in place of Wilmer Stover, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA

John B. Blanton, Nichols, S. C., in place of C. V. Daniel, transferred.

TENNESSEE

Charles Frank Heaton, Roan Mountain, Tenn., in place of W. T. Christian, retired.
Johnnie V. Braswell, Smyrna, Tenn., in place of N. E. Coleman, retired.

TEXAS

Ethel T. Bledsoe, Archer City, Tex., in place of Z. T. Burkett, retired.
Hugh Spinks, Menard, Tex., in place of H. P. Armstrong, removed.

UTAH

Howard D. Knight, Parowan, Utah, in place of Ivan Decker, removed.

VERMONT

Florence H. Tute, Newport Center, Vt., in place of H. J. Tute, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Burton R. Floyd, Buena Vista, Va., in place of W. H. Long, resigned.
Virgie C. Rawls, Burkeville, Va., in place of W. S. Overton, transferred.
Robert J. Bradshaw, Rice, Va., in place of R. M. Bradshaw, retired.
Ruth G. Walden, Saluda, Va., in place of L. M. Hedrick, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Wesley Wayne Gibbs, Woodinville, Wash., in place of Fred Kelly, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Helen J. Mayne, Browntown, Wis., in place of L. E. Maxfield, deceased.
Lyle A. Gallenbeck, Burnett, Wis., in place of H. H. Hilgendorf, deceased.
Ralph A. Nelson, Superior, Wis., in place of B. W. Robinson, retired.

WYOMING

Alma F. Bissell, Evansville, Wyo., in place of E. M. Sullivan, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 4, 1956:

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGES

Charles E. Whittaker, of Missouri, to be United States circuit judge, eighth circuit.
David T. Lewis, of Utah, to be United States circuit judge, 10th circuit.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Herbert G. Curtis, Glenwood.
Marie W. Nuss, Pine Hill.

ALASKA

Glenda A. Cobb, Annette.
John F. Connery, Barrow.
Frank W. Donalson, Galena.
Frances L. Nally, King Salmon.
Edna Peratrovich, Klawock.
Evelyn L. Conwell, Kotzebue.
Jenabe E. Caldwell, Unalaska.
Alice R. Brusich, Ward Cove.

ARIZONA

Cathryn A. Pulsifer, Camp Verde.
Donald L. Remm, Casa Grande.
Alice L. Maxwell, Chinle.
Nancy R. Caldwell, San Simon.

ARKANSAS

Nettie E. O'Roark, South Fort Smith.

CALIFORNIA

Elizabeth Waldron, Blue Jay.
Ethel M. Stott, Diablo.
Eugene M. Freitas, Herlong.
George P. Ashmun, Hughson.
Eugene A. Guerretaz, Orick.
Harry L. Smith, Perkins.
Donald P. Morrison, San Bruno.

COLORADO

George R. Newmyer, Center.
Charles Herman Klippel, Pueblo.
Ralph A. Nielson, Sanford.

GEORGIA

Homer E. Cook, Alto.
Adrian Dwight Massey, Canon.
Benjamin M. Woodruff, Sandy Springs.

HAWAII

Satoshi Ishimoto, Lihue.

IDAHO

James M. Lyke, Caldwell.
Leo G. Huguenin, Mullan.

ILLINOIS

LeRoy Davis, Harvel.
William C. Regan, Stronghurst.
Clifford E. Vaughn, Tiskilwa.
Clarence E. Harden, Tolono.

INDIANA

Edward A. Costomiris, Cicero.
Mary A. Stites, Deputy.
Ernest D. Littler, Dunkirk.
Vernice Dick Seward, Jr., Royal Center.
Wilfred E. Shoemaker, Yorktown.

LOUISIANA

Otis G. Darbonne, Grand Coteau.

MAINE

John E. Sargent, Fryeburg.
Kellen R. Melanson, St. Francis.

MASSACHUSETTS

Edwin L. Naylor, Dunstable.

MINNESOTA

Preston H. Anderson, Blackduck.
Carl O. Palmer, Buffalo.
Edmonde K. Evanson, Canby.
Ralph W. Breitenbach, Darwin.
Neil S. Rasmussen, Emmons.
Maurice J. Wenker, Freeport.
Harold J. Harris, Hanley Falls.
Kent S. Bigbee, Jeffers.
Irvin L. Yeiter, La Crescent.
Erwin D. Beutel, Lake Elmo.
Paul R. Norby, Mabel.
Alvord J. Ellingboe, Paynesville.
Rodger A. McRae, Swanville.
Duane J. Davis, Verndale.
John D. Mellinger, Warba.
Sidney M. Anderson, Winger.

MISSISSIPPI

Hade W. Sessums, Lena.

MISSOURI

Alfred C. Kennedy, Avondale.
Hobart C. Nicolay, Butler.
John R. Smith, Jameson.
Charles F. Hern, Jasper.
Vance A. Meares, Reeds.
Jesse O. Weaver, Steele.

MONTANA

Cecil J. Ranney, Alberton.
Ivan W. Small, Alder.
Donald W. Bell, Browning.

NEBRASKA

Edward A. Rodenburg, Deshler.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Theodore R. Butler, Portsmouth.
George W. Carr, Winnisquam.

NEW JERSEY

Joseph S. Bird, Annandale.
Jacob Fetzter, Grenloch.
William T. Reedy, Iselin.
Laura A. Bradley, Monmouth Beach.
Erma B. Moncrief, Newport.
Ray W. Lingelbach, Port Republic.
William C. Conner, South Bound Brook.

NEW MEXICO

John R. Goddard, El Rito.

NORTH DAKOTA

Carl Raymond Culver, Dickinson.
LeRoy B. Wentz, Elgin.
Lawrence D. Larsen, Kindred.
Lillian R. Van Doren, Medora.
Ruby E. Omvig, Mylo.
Orris K. Rowe, New Leipzig.

OHIO

George B. Lewis, Blue Creek.
Ruben E. Spurrier, Buffalo.
William Edward Dornan, Canton.
Charles H. Walters, Circleville.
James W. Broad, Clyde.
Dale R. Wyker, Grove City.
Carrie Elizabeth Copley, Helena.
Gene F. Richards, Hollansburg.
James F. Church, Loudonville.
Carey W. Hodson, Mowrystown.
Edwin L. Seitz, Sebring.
James P. Emmitt, Tallmadge.

OKLAHOMA

Nell E. Neville, Altus.

OREGON

Lester W. Heise, Adams.
Nell L. Morfitt, Astoria.
John Gordon Watts, Beaver Creek.
Francis L. Norton, Blachly.

PENNSYLVANIA

Gladys V. Lacey, Buena Vista.
James E. Sutton, Evans City.
Richard M. Bitner, Lansdale.
Richard S. Chesonis, Lucernemines.
Henry R. Heintz, Perkiomenville.
Grace G. Hendricks, Trexlertown.
Richard J. Griffith, Trucksville.
Leslie E. Carlisle, Sr., Verona.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Manly D. Padgett, Edgefield.
Rodney A. Russell, Troy.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Clayton L. Gibbs, Groton.
Philip S. Aldrich, Milbank.
Merton C. Matter, Orient.
Eva K. Gayken, Worthing.

TENNESSEE

Charles Ray Winton, Coalmont.
Raymond B. Cox, Cottage Grove.
Betty L. Milton, Duff.
Charles W. Meals, Gibson.

TEXAS

Edward H. Wester, Floydada.
James P. Fortenberry, Friona.

VERMONT

Harvey A. Dix, Brattleboro.

VIRGINIA

George Guy Farrar, Afton.
Carl C. Mason, Bridgewater.
Jane D. Nottingham, Carrollton.
Clinton Lewis Epperson, Lawrenceville.
Robert L. Via, Roanoke.
Harry L. Buston, Jr., Tazewell.

WEST VIRGINIA

Kenneth B. Rouzee, Kingwood.

WISCONSIN

Raymond E. Feller, Antigo.
Michael J. Stieber, Colby.
Benjamin F. Goehring, Random Lake.
Percy E. Braatz, Shiocton.
Francis Mattis, Stone Lake.

WYOMING

Bruce L. Bartholomew, Dayton.
LeRoy Williams, Grass Creek.
Noreen C. Hopkins, Story.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 4, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art always willing and able to bless us according to our needs, may we begin this new week with gladness and gratitude and continue it with calmness and courage.

Grant that in all our plans and purposes to serve our generation we may be inspired by the loftiest motives and employ the noblest means.

Show us how we may minister more effectively and efficiently to the welfare of all humanity, giving wise counsel to the baffled and perplexed, consolation to the sorrowing, companionship to the lonely, and strength to the burdened.

May we daily have within our hearts the joy of knowing that we are living useful and helpful lives and making a worthy contribution to a real and right solution of mankind's many difficult problems.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 31, 1956, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1671. An act for the relief of Clement E. Sprouse;

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Elizabeth Doherty;

H. R. 2216. An act to amend the act of June 19, 1948 (ch. 511, 62 Stat. 489), relating to the retention in the service of disabled commissioned officers and warrant officers of the Army and Air Force;

H. R. 4229. An act to provide running mates for certain staff corps officers in the naval service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4437. An act relating to withholding for State employee retirement system purposes, on the compensation of certain civilian employees of the National Guard and the Air National Guard;

H. R. 4569. An act to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes;

H. R. 4704. An act to provide for the examination preliminary to promotion of officers of the naval service;

H. R. 5268. An act to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the payment of mileage allowances for overland travel by private conveyance outside the continental limits of the United States;

H. R. 7679. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the city of Muskogee, Okla.;

H. R. 8477. An act to amend title II of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, by providing flexibility in the distribution of women officers in the grades of commander and lieutenant commander, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8490. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Bonham, Tex.;

H. R. 8674. An act to provide for the return of certain property to the city of Bi-lox, Miss.;

H. R. 9358. An act to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to issue a deed to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for certain land heretofore conveyed to such city, removing the conditions and reservations made a part of such prior conveyance; and

H. R. 10251. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to deed certain land to the city of Grand Junction, Colo.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2048. An act for the relief of certain former employees of the Inland Waterways Corporation;

S. 2771. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use at the Fourth National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes;

S. 2772. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in England in 1957; and for other purposes; and

S. 3760. An act to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs, and for other related purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1866. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas V. Compton;

H. R. 2106. An act to provide that the enlistment contracts or periods of obligated service of members of the Armed Forces shall not terminate by reason of appointment as cadets or midshipmen at the Military, Naval, Air Force, or Coast Guard Academies, or as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4363. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the State of New Mexico;

H. R. 7471. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the Board of Commissioners of St. Johns County, Fla.; and

H. R. 8123. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Ore.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10899. An act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. STENNIS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. KNOWLAND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the

House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3515. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to assist in the provision of housing for essential civilian employees of the Armed Forces.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill just messaged from the Senate, H. R. 10899, making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCormack). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PRESTON, THOMAS, ROONEY, YATES, SHELLEY, FLOOD, CANNON, CLEVENGER, BOW, HORAN, MILLER of Maryland, and TABER.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPRO- PRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 9390) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2250)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9390) "making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 14, 17, 31, 32, 33, and 34.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 36 and 37, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$18,369,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,240,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$15,862,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$44,300,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$10,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$12,190,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"WOODROW WILSON CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION COMMISSION

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of August 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 964, 965), as amended, \$48,500."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 8, 10, 16, 18, 27, 28, and 35.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
WM. F. NORRELL,
ALFRED D. SEMINSKI,
DON MAGNUSON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MILTON R. YOUNG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9390) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Research in the utilization of saline water

The conferees concur in the statement of the House report to the effect that the \$50,000 reduction in the budget estimate is to apply to the item of administration and coordination.

Office of the Solicitor

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$2,835,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,800,000 as proposed by the House.

Office of Minerals Mobilization

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$300,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$225,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Land Management

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$18,369,-300 for management of lands and resources instead of \$18,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$18,738,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Permits the purchase of 31 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate, instead of 25 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$50,720,-000 for education and welfare services as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$50,700,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates \$16,200,-000 for resources management as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$16,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$5,240,000 for construction, instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House, and \$7,740,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have approved the construction program as set forth in the justifications and recognize the need of future appropriations to cover the total costs.

Amendment No. 8: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 9: Permits the purchase of 290 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate, instead of 270 as proposed by the House.

Geological Survey

Amendment No. 10: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 11: Permits the purchase of 126 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of 100 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Mines

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates \$15,862,-750 for conservation and development of mineral resources, instead of \$15,363,000 as proposed by the House, and \$17,363,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funds for mining research at the oil shale plant, Rifle, Colorado, have been disallowed. Of the increase above the House figure, \$100,000 is for laboratory research on oil shale and shale oil at Laramie, Wyoming.

National Park Service

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates \$11,562,-000 for management and protection as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$11,480,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 14: Strikes out language proposed by the Senate which would have made the construction appropriation immediately available.

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates \$15,250,-000 for construction as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$15,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 17: Strikes out language proposed by the Senate which would have made the construction (liquidation of contract authorization) appropriation immediately available.

Amendment No. 18: Reported in disagreement.

Fish and Wildlife Service

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates \$10,373,-600 for management of resources as proposed by the Senate instead of \$9,696,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates \$5,105,-000 for investigations of resources as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,065,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates \$2,471,-000 for construction as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22: Permits the purchase of 131 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of 97 as proposed by the House.

General provisions, Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 23: Strikes out House language limiting funds for informational services.

*TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES**Department of Agriculture**Forest Service*

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates \$44,-300,750 for national forest protection and management instead of \$41,668,000 as proposed by the House and \$46,063,500 as proposed by the Senate. Of the increase above the House figure, \$250,000 is for soil and water management, and \$620,000 is for reforestation.

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates \$10,000,-000 for forest research instead of \$9,350,000 as proposed by the House and \$10,650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Inserts a heading, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 27 and 28: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates \$12,190,-000 for state and private forestry cooperation instead of \$11,385,000 as proposed by the House and \$15,165,000 as proposed by the Senate. An increase of \$495,000 above the House figure has been provided for cooperation in forest tree planting and \$310,000 for cooperation in forest management and processing.

National Capital Planning Commission

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates \$200,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$185,000 as proposed by the House and \$210,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 31-34: Appropriate \$1,250,000 for land acquisition as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate and provide for allocations as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35: Reported in disagreement.

Smithsonian Institution

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates \$4,425,-000 for salaries and expenses, Smithsonian Institution, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$4,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates \$1,505,-000 for salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,495,000 as proposed by the House.

Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates \$48,500 as proposed by the Senate.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
DON MAGNUSON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider en bloc those amendments on which the House managers will offer a motion to recede and concur, as follows: Nos. 8, 10, 16, 27, 28, and 35.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: Page 7, line 7, insert " , of which not to exceed \$240,000 may be paid to the Municipal School District No. 1, Sandoval County, N. Mex., to supplement an allocation of funds from the Office of Education for the construction of elementary public school facilities which shall be available to Pueblo Indian children."

Senate amendment No. 10: Page 11, line 7, strike out "and the preparation of plans and specifications for a building or buildings to meet the special needs of the Geological Survey in the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C." and insert "and for the Geological Survey or the General Services Administration to acquire a site and to prepare plans and specifications for a building or buildings to meet the special needs of the Geological Survey in the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C., without regard to Revised Statutes, page 3709, as amended (41 U. S. C. 5), and section 302 (c) of the act of June 30, 1949, as amended (41 U. S. C. 252 (c))."

Senate amendment No. 16: Page 16, line 4, insert " , of which not to exceed \$250,000 shall be available for the construction of additional school facilities at Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz."

Senate amendment No. 27: Page 34, line 23, insert:

"WEEKS ACT"

"For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U. S. C. 513-519, 521), \$100,000, to be available only for payment of the purchase price of any lands acquired, including the cost of surveys in connection with such acquisition: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for acquisition of any land which is not within the boundaries of a national forest: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of any land without the approval of the local government concerned."

Senate amendment No. 28: Page 35, line 9, insert:

"SPECIAL ACTS"

"For the acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior boundaries of the following national forest, in accordance with the provisions of the following act authorizing annual appropriations of forest receipts for such purposes, and in not to exceed the following amount from such receipts: Cache National Forest, Utah, act of May 11, 1938 (Public Law 505), as amended, \$10,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for acquisition of any land which is not within the boundaries of a national forest: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of any land without the approval of the local government concerned."

Senate amendment No. 35: Page 40, line 7, insert " : *Provided further*, That the employment of not more than one person by contract or otherwise, pursuant to the third sentence of section 2 (c) of the act of June 6, 1924, as amended by the act of July 19, 1952 (66 Stat. 783), may be extended for an additional year."

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 8, 10, 16, 27, 28, and 35 and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18: Page 17, line 2, insert "": *Provided*, That all receipts from the operation of the McKinley Park Hotel in Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska, may be applied to, or offset against, costs of managing, operating, and maintaining the hotel and related facilities, and any receipts or other revenues in excess of such costs shall be deposited at least annually into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "": *Provided*, That all receipts for the fiscal year 1957 from the operation of the McKinley Park Hotel in Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska, may be applied to, or offset against, costs of managing, operating, and maintaining the hotel and related facilities, and any receipts or other revenues in excess of such costs shall be deposited at least annually into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

SEGREGATION

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues, I have recently been faced with a primary campaign in my district, which is the Eighth District of Florida. I am humbly grateful to the wonderful citizens of our district because they gave me an overwhelming majority over my opponent. I have always tried to the best of my ability to keep every campaign promise, and I emphasized to our people in my recent campaign my determination to present their viewpoints in Congress concerning the problems of segregation in our public schools, which the Supreme Court declared unconstitutional 2 years ago. I pledged to my people that I would do everything within the law to maintain segregation in our public schools. I repeat a statement concerning the Supreme Court's decision on segregation that I made in Congress over 2 years ago:

Let me tell you the attitude of the majority of the people of both races in the Eighth Congressional District of Florida, which I represent. They view this decision as fraught with dangers comparable to the tragedies of World Wars I and II, and the emergence of the Communist terror.

I did not exaggerate the situation then, and I find in the light of my recent campaign that, if anything, I understated the attitude of the majority of the citizens of the Eighth District of Florida.

I believe that those of us who live in the Deep South should make every effort calmly, but honestly, to present to the Nation the great tragedy of a Supreme Court decision that discounts the Jeffersonian conception of States rights, and takes away from our separate States those rights that were delegated to them specifically in the Constitution. I do not believe this problem of segregation in our public schools will ever be solved satisfactorily unless we revert to the theory of States rights. I believe Florida should be given the privilege of handling this problem as Florida sees best to handle it. I ask for the same privilege on the part of the other 47 States in the Union.

I know just about everything has already been said on this subject that could be said, but I want to present one thought that perhaps is a little different. Some of the critics of the Supreme Court's decision on segregation have suggested that the members of the Court based their ruling on sociology rather than on law. If the decision were based on sociology, may I say that I do not believe it was based on sound sociological principles. One of the basic facts a sociologist learns is that you cannot legislate the mores and traditions of a people. Yet by a Supreme Court decision which has the effect of legislation, we are trying to legislate the mores and traditions of many millions of our citizens.

One thing that many of the fine people I represent in the Eighth District of Florida resent is the fact that in so many of our northern newspapers we never have presented the factual problems that have been provoked by the integration of races. In this connection, I would like to include an article from one of the great newspapers of Florida, the Florida Times-Union in its issue of Thursday, May 31, 1956. This article concerns rioting by Negro teen-agers on a vessel plying between Buffalo and Crystal Beach amusement park in Ontario. The article points out that the Negro teen-agers turned the vessel into a nightmare of flashing knives and sobbing, frightened passengers. The article further points out that of the approximately 1,000 persons who made the trip, about 80 percent were Negroes and that most of the trouble was caused by gangs of Negro girls who walked the deck, attacking and molesting young white girls. The complete article follows:

NEGROES ATTACK WHITES ON SHIP

BUFFALO, N. Y., May 30.—Rioting by Negro teen-agers on a vessel plying between here and Crystal Beach amusement park in Ontario tonight turned the vessel into a nightmare of flashing knives and sobbing, frightened passengers.

The riots broke out on the *Canadiana* after a day of disorders at the amusement park.

Fourteen persons were injured at the park, and nine Buffalo youths were arrested by Ontario provincial police. Five of those arrested were Negroes and four were white.

Three teen-aged youths were taken into custody by Buffalo police when the ship docked, but no charges were placed against them immediately.

Courier-Express reporters Margaret Wynn and Dick Hirsch described the boat trip as a nightmare of flashing knives and sobbing, frightened teen-agers.

HIDE IN DINING ROOM

They said the youngsters, several beaten or cut, cowered below decks in the ship's dining room for most of the trip after being attacked or threatened by the many Negro teen-agers who made up the majority of the passengers.

"Above deck," the reporters wrote, "all hell had broken loose as roving groups of Negroes calmly attacked the outnumbered whites."

"Girls were beaten mercilessly and youths who attempted to defend them were slugged and kicked without feeling."

UNABLE TO KEEP ORDER

"Members of the ship's crew and private police vainly attempted to keep order, but when one fight was broken up, another flared in a different portion of the weather-beaten boat."

"Of the approximately 1,000 persons who made the trip, about 80 percent were Negroes."

"Most of the trouble was caused by gangs of Negro girls who walked the deck, attacking and molesting young white girls."

Members of the Canadian crew told the newsmen that the demonstration was the worst on record.

You see, Mr. Speaker, in certain areas of the South the white race is in the minority. Now when you get a national minority who are in the majority in certain areas of our great country anyone who understands anything at all about the problems of this great Republic of ours can realize the dangers of such a situation.

The only answer is a return to the Constitution—a return to the Jeffersonian conception of States rights. There are many of us who have found that the Supreme Court's encroachment has manifested itself into other areas properly reserved to the States by the Constitution, and I am hoping with all my heart that we can agree on legislation that will be effective in returning to the States their sovereign rights. I shall certainly support such legislation at every opportunity. America is a republic. We are a sovereign nation composed of sovereign States. Rights not specifically granted to the Federal Government are reserved for the States. That is the Constitution of our beloved country. We must return to the Constitution in this grave crisis.

INTEGRATION IN THE SOUTH

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court of the United States pronounced an edict which already has had a profound impact, and promises to have an even greater one, on the basic way of life in many of our States, and in the Deep South in particular. I refer to the amazingly broad interpretation placed by the Supreme Court on the 14th amendment to our Constitution, an amendment which became effective July 28, 1868. This far-reaching interpretation holds that the various States may not segregate white

and Negro children in their public schools solely on the basis of race.

The 14th amendment states that—

No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States.

I believe that this broad interpretation would actually work both ways: integration could be as much an abridgment of the rights of white children as segregation supposedly is an abridgment of the rights of Negro children.

From the date the 14th amendment became effective, July 28, 1868, until May 17, 1954, a period of 86 years, the executive branch of our Government, both State and Federal, the National Congress, the State legislatures, and the Federal and State courts made clear that under the Constitution of the United States power to control public schools in the States was reserved for each State, that a State could establish and operate schools for white and Negro children, and that by so doing there would be no conflict with the letter and intent of the 14th amendment. Just why the nine men who made up the Supreme Court in 1954 chose to go so far afield in their interpretation after these many years is something that I cannot answer. I do know that this decision has resulted in near chaos throughout the South, and is giving a fine outlet to those forces in our midst who are ever seeking some occasion to raise a hue and cry for the so-called oppressed and impoverished underdog, in whom they are interested not one whit, except as a means to further their own cause.

Let us say this, however, to those who would rush in precipitously to force an unacceptable social and educational system upon the South. The Supreme Court decree has awakened the South—and there are signs that enlightened elements in the North are stirring. We realize that the rights that have historically been preserved to the States must be preserved inviolate if we are to keep our Federal system of government. I am not speaking merely of the right to maintain separate schools, for this is only one of the many rights that have long belonged to the individual States. If the Constitution of our land can be so freely and so arbitrarily interpreted, what is there to prevent the same thing happening in the Bill of Rights, or any one of the other amendments? There is nothing but the people—and I say this to you today—if there is a need for a change in our basic law, then it can only be done by lawful process, not by judicial decree. The good people of the South, white and colored, have always been in the thick of the battle, when the cause was just. This battle, though it will be fought by every legal means, and not with weapons of war, is perhaps one of the most important the people of the country as a whole have ever been called upon to wage. The challenge has been thrown down. It is our way of life versus anarchy.

It will be interesting to note the qualifications and experience of the nine members of the Supreme Court in 1954. Justice Hugo Black had prior qualifying judicial experience only as police judge

for 18 months. Justices Harlan and Minton were the only other members of the Supreme Court with prior judicial experience and, interestingly enough, their prior judgeships were appointive in nature. The other members of the Supreme Court did not have prior judicial experience. While these nine men who are political appointees are charged with great powers and responsibility in their positions on the Supreme Court of the United States, I cannot help but feel that these men—like all human beings—are subject to human frailties. They can make mistakes. They can be subjected to pressure and influences. Must the customs and the traditions and the way of life of millions of American citizens be completely revamped because the Supreme Court suddenly saw fit to reverse prior rulings?

I have never in the past, nor will I ever in the future, suppressed or stood in the way of the progress of any segment of the masses which make up our fine American citizenry. On the contrary, I have personally done what I could to help my fellow man, regardless of race, creed, or color. I have only to point to one of the basic principles which has been fostered by the Long family in Louisiana, and which was inaugurated and given a great start by my brother, the late Huey P. Long, former Governor of Louisiana and United States Senator. Louisiana was one of the first States to abolish the poll tax. When free schoolbooks were given by Huey P. Long, they were given to all schoolchildren, regardless of race, color, or creed. The free lunch program likewise was initiated by my brother, Earl Long, now Governor, for the third time, of the State of Louisiana.

For several years before I was grown, a family of colored people, including about 6 boys and 2 girls, lived on my father's farm some 200 yards from my home. My older brother and I played and went fishing with these colored boys. We often went to their house before breakfast, because their mother was a wonderful cook. My father found out that we were eating breakfast at this home, and threatened to whip us if we imposed on this family any longer. One morning, however, when my father was away, my brother Julius and I once again slipped over for breakfast. Our father returned and called us. We rushed home, and, my older brother, knowing what was coming, let me take the lead. When father reached me he began to whip me, not so much for visiting the colored family, but for taking food out of their mouths and for disobedience. I howled as if I were experiencing great pain, when suddenly an old Catahoula hog dog rushed to my rescue, and began to pinch father in the seat of the pants. That ended the beating, for father took off after the dog. I learned two lessons that day. One was that I should obey my father in the future. I also learned that right-thinking white people are, and always have been, considerate of the colored people. I merely recite this to show that I was not brought up to hate people because of their color, and what I am saying here today is as much in the interest of the

good colored people as it is the white. I have discussed this matter with many fine people of the colored race, including preachers, lawyers, doctors, and farmers, and, with the exception of a few who belong to the NAACP, I have found that they would sincerely regret to see the segregation barriers broken down. They want their schools and their teachers. They want their churches and their preachers. They want their families. That is exactly what we all want, and is what we are trying to preserve.

The great tragedy of the present situation is that the people who are most closely involved with the nine-man decision, the people, Negro and white, who know the situation, are strongly against it. Intelligent, informed people in the North are against it. Who, then, are the ones that are fanning the flames most violently? Communist-inspired organizations are in the forefront of a nefarious plot to dupe the innocent Negro and cause the white man to become an object of hatred. Does anyone here think that these actions are taken because of any real sympathetic feeling for the colored race? The Communists have vowed not to rest until the United States becomes subject to their power, and they are at present concentrating their power against the South. By turning brother against brother, by turning race against race, they hope to succeed in demoralizing one great segment of our country. With the South as a base for their insidious fomenting of dissension, the enslavement of the whole Union will be much simpler. For if you can turn two races of people against each other, people who have lived and worked side by side in peace and harmony for over 200 years, by a program of slander and hypocrisy, then think of the tremendous possibilities; first, white against black; then Catholic against Protestant; labor against capital; city dweller against farmer. Friends, it is the old, old slogan of Divide and conquer. They are trying to divide us now. If they succeed, they will not stop until the whole Nation is conquered. We would be judged guilty of cowardice by future generations if we in the South did not take the stand set forth in the southern manifesto, a noble and courageous document.

I am impressed by an article concerning the question of integration written by a prominent northern Negro editor. His comments, with which I agree, reflect the opinion of serious minded and informed persons throughout our Nation, and are in opposition to the so-called bleeding hearts, radicals, rabblers, agitators, and the just plain uninformed in our midst. What do those people really want; equal educational opportunity for the Negro or just plain integration? Most people who have studied the situation agree that the southern Negro is better off educationally than the northern Negro, because an honest effort is being made to give the southern Negro an equal opportunity to get an education, new job opportunities are becoming daily more available, and the Negro is able to take a position of leadership in all fields on a fairly segregated basis. For example, there are Negro doctors, lawyers, dentists, storekeepers, businessmen,

farmers, and workmen who, in a semi-segregated area, are able to maintain and live in an atmosphere of harmony with all and in a position of full leadership. In a completely integrated society, what intelligent person thinks that the Negro can operate in a position of full leadership and withstand the pressures of competition in a single economic unit? He does very well under the present arrangement of a dual-economic system.

If the southern Negro is seeking a greater educational opportunities, we have only to look about us to see that he is getting them. He plays the major role in an educational system which he directs. I firmly believe that racial problems cannot be solved by mixing the races. The Negro welcomes the opportunity to run his own schools, hospitals, churches, civic and social organizations. I do not think the Negro should be placed in the position of asking others to accept him into their society. He could attain a like objective by conducting himself in such a manner that all men would respect him for what he is as a person. Friendship between white and Negro would then have a concrete and natural basis. The Negro would do better to put forward qualified leaders in his race, to show his fellow Negroes how to make the most of the opportunities they already have. In my opinion, the southern Negro is being made the dupe of the biased, the radicals, and the uninformed.

To understand the great problem confronting the South brought about by the question of integration, we must first understand why the South differs from other sections of the country on this question. The Negro makes up approximately 10 percent of the overall population of the United States. In the 11 States of the Deep South are to be found 60 percent of all the Negroes in the United States. Since these 11 Southern States contain only 24 percent of the overall national total of all races in the United States, the ratio of Negro to whites is 1 to 4. Nationwide the ratio of Negro to whites is 1 to 10. California has only 4 percent Negro population; Pennsylvania, 5 percent; Indiana, 4 percent; Illinois, 7 percent; New York, 6 percent; and it is logical that these and other States with such a low percentage of Negro population can neither understand nor share the problems of integration which are visited upon our Southern States. For example, Alabama has 32 percent Negro population; Mississippi, 45 percent; South Carolina, 39 percent; Louisiana, 33 percent, and Georgia, 31 percent Negro population. With such a vast difference in the basic problems involved, it is only natural that a wide divergence in opinion concerning the whole issue should exist. The average Negro family in most areas being larger than the average white family, integration would necessarily result in many classrooms containing up to 50 percent or more Negro children. Obviously, there is a tremendous difference then in those classrooms being affected in this manner by integration and in those classrooms outside the South which would contain, for example, only 3, 4, or 5 percent Negro children.

It is extremely important that the high percentage of Negro population in the South be kept in mind in viewing the problems confronting integration. It is easy for the uninformed to shout for integration immediately, to insist that the southern Negro is oppressed and downtrodden, and that the only solution is through immediate integration; to insist that the South overcome decades and decades of tradition and custom and habits to accommodate the edict of nine Supreme Court Judges; that eyes be closed to mental, moral, and social barriers. No thinking person can fail to see the fallacy of immediate integration.

Segregation is nothing new in this world. In fact, it governs all forms of life in the world of nature—be it animal, vegetable, or mineral. Such rules are influenced by many factors which develop a basis for segregation, and the same is true of human beings. Some races and groups are held together by common bonds of temperament or culture and of physical characteristics which do not lend themselves to intermingling with other races and groups. Various species of fish segregate themselves. The birds of the air are clannish and are not inclined to intermingle. Even similar forest growths and plants and shrubs are inclined to stick together. It is certainly logical that this plan of life would carry over into human beings. Any attempt to go contrary to nature and to force integration will only result in discontentment, confusion, and a complete disruption of the orderly process of life.

ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 521, Rept. No. 2254), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1840) to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill, H. R. 1840, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit. After the passage of the bill, H. R. 1840, it shall be in order to move to strike out the number H. R. 1840 and title and provisions thereof and to substitute in lieu thereof the number H. R. 11 and the title and provisions thereof; provided, however, that such motion shall not be debatable.

CABINET COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, on May 31, 1956, President Dwight D. Eisenhower in a letter to Arthur F. Burns, Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers, notified him as follows:

I am establishing a Cabinet Committee on Small Business of which I would like you to serve as Chairman.

I should like to compliment the President and this administration on the recognition of the importance of small concerns and the many men and women serving their community in this capacity.

In establishing this Committee the President has designated as members the Secretaries of Defense, Commerce, Labor, the Director of Office of Defense Mobilization, the Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Administrator of Small Business Administration.

In his communication the President definitely expects this Committee to make specific recommendations, not only for administrative action, but also for additional legislation that will strengthen the economic position of small business as well as promote and develop the opportunities of all small-business concerns throughout the Nation so they may continue to benefit in the excellent economic progress we are now experiencing. I enclose the letter:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 31, 1956.

The Honorable ARTHUR F. BURNS,
Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The important contributions made by small-business concerns to the progressive spirit and vitality of the American economy have repeatedly been stressed in my economic reports to the Congress and on various other occasions. Such enterprises, of which there are some 4 million currently in operation, serve continuously as a dynamic influence in our enterprise system. It is often through them that new products and new processes are first brought into use. Equally important, it is in small concerns that many men and women find an opportunity to demonstrate their ability to serve constructively in the business world. For these and related reasons, Government policies that make it easier for new businesses to be established and that foster the growth of small concerns enhance the welfare of the whole economy.

The Federal Government has a number of programs now in operation that are significantly helpful to small businesses.

The Department of Commerce helps constantly in the solution of management problems for small businesses through its Office of Technical Services, Office of Area Development, Business and Defense Services Administration, and Office of Business Economics.

Financial assistance is available to small concerns through the Small Business Administration.

Jointly with the Department of Defense and with other Federal departments and agencies, the Small Business Administration assists small concerns in obtaining Government procurement contracts.

Many small construction companies and related businesses benefit from the home financing programs administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The Office of Defense Mobilization seeks to strengthen the production potential of small firms in our defense programs.

Through its enforcement of the antitrust laws, the Department of Justice helps maintain the competitive environment that is essential to the Nation's economic welfare.

These and other programs and policies of the Federal Government facilitate the establishment of new concerns and foster the growth of small businesses. Yet the conditions of our modern economy are such that many small concerns confront substantial hindrances to their growth. It is my wish that the Federal Government keep fully abreast of developments that affect small businesses. Its programs and policies aimed at assisting small businesses should be carefully reviewed at this time with the object of strengthening them where necessary, and of making recommendations for steps that will provide such enterprises with additional constructive assistance.

To this end I am establishing a Cabinet Committee on Small Business of which I would like you to serve as Chairman. By copies of this letter I am designating the Secretaries of Defense, Commerce, Labor, the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration and the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency as members. Other department and agency heads will participate on an ad hoc basis as may be deemed desirable. The Committee is to have the continuing assignment of making specific recommendations to me for administrative actions, and where necessary for additional legislation, to strengthen the economic position of small businesses and to foster their sound development.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and at the conclusion of my remarks to extend my remarks by the addition of a speech made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] addressed the Georgia Bar Association convention at Savannah on May 25, 1956. Every Member of this body knows that the Georgia bar could not have selected one more competent, courageous, and ethical. His address was most scholarly, factual, and illuminating. His address reflects tireless work over many years and a complete devotion to constitutional government. Our colleague pointed out facts concerning our Supreme Court and its personnel that few others have tried to discover. Everyone knows that when this colleague speaks, he has the facts and logic to sustain him. This House and our Nation should have the privilege of reading that address, which follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, my fellow members of the Georgia Bar Association, ladies, and gentlemen, I am conscious of the high privilege which it is to address this association. I appreciate deeply the invitation to participate in your program today.

It is a particular pleasure to talk to the association while Henry Bowden is our president. I have for many years regarded him as one of Georgia's outstanding lawyers, and during my entire acquaintance with him, I have held him in affectionate regard.

I take this opportunity to compliment him and the association upon the year of splendid progress we have experienced under his wise, able, and energetic leadership.

May I express also the pleasure which is mine to be presented by my good friend, JACK FLYNN, our immediate past president of the association. I knew him well and appreciated his talents when he was in the active practice of law, and while serving as solicitor general of the Griffin judicial circuit. I have observed him closely in Washington where he has diligently applied himself to the task of representing Georgia's Fourth Congressional District. He is making the same reputation in Washington which he has already made in Georgia as a man who has the courage of his convictions, who is capable and efficient, who is a tireless worker for his constituents, and an effective fighter for the principles in which he believes.

We are facing today, I believe, the most critical period which America has faced since 1776, when a small group of men met in Philadelphia to choose between security and peace on the one hand, which could be purchased at the price of continued submission to tyrannical oppression, or revolution and war with the world's greatest power on the other hand. With the certain knowledge that years of misery and suffering lay ahead, that they would fight against heavy odds, and that defeat and death might be the portion of everyone who participated, they believed in their hearts that free government was worth the price they had to pay. They threw their all into the balance as they fought for it. Our Government of liberty, freedom, and opportunity today is the result of that choice and of the fight which they made.

Freedom was not just a topic of idle conversation with them. Integrity was more than a word in the dictionary.

In setting up a constitution to guarantee free government, they were aware that their liberty was hard won. They knew that ambitious human beings are selfish and ruthless, and they knew that human rights can be whittled away little by little by ambitious schemers.

They, therefore, set up this Government of ours to function as three coequal departments, each of the three separate from and independent of the others. The foundation of this free Government was a written Constitution. It was put in writing so that its lasting principles would not be subject to passing whims or fancies. They provided a specific way to amend the document if changing times and conditions ever required it. All of us are familiar with that method of amendment. Nothing less than a vote of two-thirds of the Congress ratified by three-fourths of the States will serve to change it. Without this concurrent action not a sentence or word of the Constitution can be changed.

Among his other great qualities, President George Washington was a wise statesman. He knew the need for reciprocal checks and balances in maintaining free government. Looking ahead to the future of this new Government, he feared that these reciprocal checks and balances might be upset by one of the three departments usurping the functions of another. Warning against this danger, he said in his Farewell Address on September 17, 1796:

"If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be, in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment, in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

Today our free Government faces the danger which George Washington feared, and against which he warned us in the words I have just repeated. This danger comes from attempts by the Supreme Court of the United States to usurp functions which it

does not possess, functions which belong exclusively to the Congress and to the States.

For nearly a century and a half the Supreme Court deserved the respect which it received. It justified the confidence of the people that it would uphold the Constitution. It proclaimed the Constitution as written, regardless of consequences, knowing that the people had the power to amend it, if and whenever amendment became necessary. During the period I refer to, the personnel of the Court were selected primarily because of demonstrated legal ability. They possessed the necessary integrity and fidelity to the Constitution to function within their own prescribed jurisdiction. The Supreme Court as then constituted, was a roadblock in the pathway of any person or group who sought to destroy or weaken our Government and its systems of checks and balances. The Court refused to trifle with the Constitution.

Then came the era of Court-packing. A President of the United States contemptuously referred to the Supreme Court as "nine old men." He asked the Congress to vote him legal authority to pack the Court by increasing its membership. When Congress refused to grant this authority, he asked the people to purge the Congress of those courageous Members who refused to pack the Court with rubberstamp reformers. The people refused to request to purge. They endorsed the Court for its fidelity to constitutional functions. They endorsed the Congress for its refusal to pack the Court.

But the passage of time and the occurrence of vacancies gave the opportunity to pack the Court which Congress and the people had denied. Court-packing became the vogue. It is still the vogue in our Government.

We saw an era then in which the Supreme Court entered upon an orgy of usurping legislative functions, and rewriting the Constitution. It was obvious to anyone who would take the trouble to look that the Court was following a pattern of overruling long-settled previous decisions and of usurping the functions of Congress and the States in changing the meaning of our Constitution through so-called interpretation. I began to point this out on the floor of the House of Representatives in 1949. I warned of the Court's attempt to legislate judicially, and I said then:

"It is time for the bar of the Nation to take note of this practice. It is time for Congress to take note of it, and time for the people to take note of it."

"One of the evils of such a system is that it destroys respect for both the courts and the law."

"The decisions of such a court have no permanent value as precedents."

Just recently I obtained from the Library of Congress a table showing that in the 14-year period from 1937 to 1951 the Supreme Court rendered 39 so-called judicial decisions arbitrarily overruling previous decisions of the Court. In some of these decisions the Court overruled only one case. In some they arbitrarily overruled two previously decided cases. In some they overruled as many as 3 decisions in 1 case. In 1 case, they overruled 5 previous decisions.

The trend of the Supreme Court as presently constituted has been to flout the law and the Constitution; to regard the whole body of the law as an uncharted sea; to arrogate unto themselves complete authority to make law as they think it should be made, to arbitrarily overrule with 1 stroke of the pen 1 decision, 3 decisions, 5 decisions, or any number of decisions which do not conform to their pattern of Government changing, and finally to read into the United States Constitution language and meaning which is not there, and which the Court, the Congress, and the people concurrently agreed for 164 years so far as the Constitution itself is concerned, and for 86 years, so far as the 14th amendment is concerned, was never intended to be a part of the Constitution.

Probably the hardest blow struck at our Constitution by this present Supreme Court was the school segregation decision of May 17, 1954.

In that case all pretense at following the law was dropped by the Court. Its decision in substance and effect was that changing times and conditions require a changed interpretation of the 14th amendment, and we hereby change it.

This judicial fiat was not supported by legal authority. It overruled as an arbitrary edict all the previously established and settled law on the subject. Instead of citing legal authority, it cited only sociological works and treatises. Many of the authors of the authorities cited are well known to have numerous Communist front connections.

In addition to its departure from law and precedent, this Court which sets itself up as the arbiter of our destiny has demonstrated an inconsistency which is equaled only by its contempt for the Constitution and law. The Court affirmed the case of *Jones v. Opelika* (316 U. S. 584) at the October term, 1941. One year later, at the October 1942 term of the Court in the same case of *Jones v. Opelika*, on the same petition for certiorari, the Court reversed its decision set out in 316 United States 584. The language in the first decision of the case (316 U. S. 584) is just as firm, positive, and certain in support of the principle therein announced, as was the language holding exactly the opposite in the second decision of the case (319 U. S. 103).

On November 21, 1955, in case No. 436, *Cahill v. The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company*, the Court granted a writ of certiorari and reversed a judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, thus taking the final step in affirming a verdict for \$90,000 damages in favor of Cahill. The railroad paid the money to the injured employee, who used a considerable portion of it in paying debts, buying a home, et cetera.

On May 14, 1956, the Court reversed itself, and solemnly held that its decision of November 21, 1955, was wrong, and that Cahill was not entitled to the money.

This wishy-washy dealing with the law, as the Court did in these cases, and the wholesale action of overruling previous decisions in 39 cases in 14 years, brings the Court into disrepute.

It raises doubts and questions in the minds of the public regarding not only this Court, but all courts and all law.

The man in the street can only wonder, "Is the law as uncertain as that? Is the meaning of the Constitution as uncertain as that?"

When the highest court in our land decides at one term of court that the law is one thing, and in the same case at the next term of court solemnly proclaims that the law is exactly the opposite of its previous decision, and then repeats the exact process 2 years later in another case, we have a feeling of sympathy with Mr. Bumble, Charles Dickens' character in *Oliver Twist*, who said, "If the law supposes that, the law is an ass, an idiot."

This custom of reckless dealing with the law has created apprehension and fears for our judicial system all over this country. Eminent lawyers and able writers have warned against the consequences of the Supreme Court's disregard of law and usurpation of powers not possessed by it. Even members of the Supreme Court, itself, in dissenting opinions, have voiced strong criticism of the Court's irresponsible actions. In the case of *Smith v. Allwright* (321 U. S. 649), Justice Roberts of the Supreme Court said:

"The reason for my concern is that the instant decision overruling one announced about 9 years ago tends to bring adjudica-

tions of this tribunal into the same class as a restricted railroad ticket, 'good for this day and train only.'"

James P. Byrnes, a distinguished American who served as Secretary of State, United States Senator, Governor, and Justice of the United States Supreme Court, and who filled many other high Federal and State offices, has sharply criticized the Court in which he formerly served. In an article in the May 18 issue of U. S. News & World Report, former Justice Byrnes said, "The Supreme Court must be curbed." He makes this flat statement regarding the Court's public-school decision of May 17, 1954:

"The Court did not interpret the Constitution—the Court amended it."

In that article, he made a statement which the whole Nation would do well to note carefully. He said:

"Today, this usurpation by the Court of the power of the States hurts the South. Tomorrow it may hurt the North, East, and West."

The Court in its dictatorial attitude and evident determination to centralize power in Washington by striking down the powers of State government, has already struck at other States far from Georgia and the South.

In the case of *Slochower v. City of New York*, just decided, the Court struck down a law of the city of New York which required the discharge of a teacher who invoked the fifth amendment and refused to answer when questioned as to membership in the Communist Party.

From the State of Pennsylvania, in the *Steve Nelson* case, the Court held that a Pennsylvania statute making subversive activities a criminal offense was unconstitutional on the ground that the Federal Government had enacted legislation on the same subject, and had thus preempted the right of the States to enact laws punishing subversive activities. This ties the hands of law-enforcement officers in every one of the 48 States so far as Communists and subversives are concerned.

While we are talking of the Supreme Court and communism, it is worthwhile to point out that for years Federal and State officials have been trying to rid this country of Harry Bridges and his pernicious influence. Bridges has been ordered deported by the Attorney General on the ground that he had affiliated with organizations advocating the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, and that he had been a member of the Communist Party. Bridges has been convicted of fraud against the United States in obtaining naturalization by perjury in denying membership in the Communist Party. And each time these cases have traveled the long route to the Supreme Court in Washington, that Court has found a way to reverse the findings against Bridges and permit him to continue his nefarious career in this country.

In the case of *Communist Party of the United States of America v. Subversive Activities Control Board*, decided less than a month ago, on April 30, this year, the Supreme Court rendered one of its most amazing decisions. In that case the Subversive Activities Control Board, after a lengthy and exhaustive hearing, found that there is a world Communist movement, organized and directed by a foreign government and that the Communist Party of the United States was a Communist-action organization. This action was begun on November 22, 1950. The Communist Party squirmed and resisted all the way through the court of appeals to the Supreme Court, where after 5½ years of litigation, the Supreme Court held that it could not pass upon a record in which the credibility of the witnesses, Paul Crouch, Harvey Matusow and Manning Johnson, had been attacked; this notwithstanding the fact that the court of appeals passed upon this very question, and held that the conclusion of the Board was supported by the basic

findings which it had affirmed, and further held that the testimony of the witnesses whose credibility was attacked was consistent with and supported by masses of other evidence.

When this astounding decision was announced the lawyers in the Justice Department in Washington were stunned. Some of them declared in public statements that this decision may prove to be the most important Communist victory in the courts within the past 10 years.

So shocking was the action of the Court that Justice Clark uttered one of the most stinging criticisms ever directed at the Court. In a dissenting opinion he said:

"The Court now says the court of appeals erred in its denial of the motion and remands the case directly to the Board for it to determine again the credibility of these three witnesses. It refuses to pass on the important questions relating to the constitutionality of the Internal Security Act of 1950, a bulwark of the congressional program to combat the menace of world communism. Believing that the Court here disregards its plain responsibility and duty to decide these important constitutional questions, I cannot join in its action."

"I have not found any case in the history of the Court where important constitutional issues have been avoided on such a pretext. . . . The action today is taken merely for delay and can result only in the Board reaffirming the action. In fact, it so advised the court of appeals and that court found all of the testimony of the questionable witnesses were supported by masses of other evidences. . . ."

"This proceeding has dragged out for many years now, and the function of the Board remains suspended and the congressional purpose frustrated at a most critical time in world history."

Recently I asked the American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress in Washington to furnish to me a list of cases in which the defendant was a Communist, or suspected of Communist activities, or charged with subversive activities, whose cases have been carried to the Supreme Court and the Communists received favorable decisions. There are 28 of such cases. They were decided in the 17-year period beginning with the year 1939. Included among them are such defendants as Harry Bridges, 3 cases; Judith Coplon, 2 cases; William Remington and Steve Nelson. Included among the list also is the *Slochower* case, striking down the New York City law which I have already referred to, and the case of *Communist Party v. Subversive Activities Control Board*, so strongly denounced by Justice Clark, whose dissenting opinion was concurred in by two other Justices.

The strange antics of this Court within the past 20 years have caused much wonderment as to why this Court which had functioned for so many years within its rightful jurisdiction, should change so radically as to transform itself from a dependable, responsible, and respected Court into an agency, which, masquerading under the guise of a court, began to devote itself to the task of nullifying existing law, legislating judicially to make new law where none existed before, and usurping power not possessed to amend the Constitution, while at the same time lending comfort and encouragement to radical movements and organizations which have grown bold and powerful during that period.

One cannot help but ask the question: Is this something that just happened unintentionally, or is it being done according to plan and program?

If there is a plan and program for the Supreme Court to change our form of government by usurping functions it does not possess, what possible explanation is there that the Court would lend itself to any such scheme?

I think there is no doubt that the Court is following such a pattern, and the explanation for it is that the Court is a packed Court, and the personnel of the Court are reformers whose primary goal is to change this Government of ours from a Republic of sovereign States into a bureaucratic Central Government, which shall be devoted not to the preservation of States rights, local self-government, and individual liberty, but shall be devoted to the promotion of socialistic doctrines, one-world government, and the radical philosophies of such groups as the Americans for Democratic Action, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and similar leftwing organizations. Its actions and its decisions in the past 20 years point directly to this conclusion.

To better understand the amazing actions and philosophy of some of the leaders of the Court, it is well to have a look at some of their activities before they went upon the Supreme Court bench.

Between 1937 and 1939 four appointments were made to the Supreme Court. Within 2 years Justices Black, Reed, Frankfurter, and Douglas were nominated and confirmed.

The name of Felix Frankfurter had been intimately associated with radical organizations for many years prior to his appointment to the position of Associate Justice.

From 1919 to at least 1937 Frankfurter was associated with the left-wing American Civil Liberties Union. He was on its national board. The American Civil Liberties Union received large sums of money, according to the House Committee on Un-American Activities, from the notorious Garland fund which was noted for its support of Communists. From the same source comes the information that the American Civil Liberties Union provided bail for the trial of Communists at Gastonia, N. C., convicted of a conspiracy to kill the chief of police. A committee of the New York State legislature said of the American Civil Liberties Union that in the last analysis it was a supporter of all subversive movements. That organization had as its director for many years Roger N. Baldwin. The records of the House Committee on Un-American Activities show that Baldwin was formerly a member of the IWW, served a term in prison as a draft-dodger during the war, and testified to the committee that his organization upheld the right of an American citizen or an alien to advocate force and violence for the overthrow of the Government. The United States House of Representatives special committee to investigate Communist activities in the United States said of the American Civil Liberties Union:

"The American Civil Liberties Union is closely affiliated with the Communist movement in the United States, and fully 90 percent of its efforts are on behalf of Communists who have come into conflict with the law."

William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party in the United States was one of Frankfurter's fellow members in the Civil Liberties Union.

In 1927 Frankfurter was found speaking at public meetings in behalf of two convicted murderers and anarchists, Nicolo Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti, to secure a pardon for them. In that effort, he was in league with Robert M. Hutchins, the present head of one of the most infamous leftwing organizations in the United States, the Fund for the Republic, whose energies and assets are being devoted to financing radical movements and organizations, and the philosophies of the NAACP.

In 1928 Frankfurter became a member of the legal committee of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the organization principally responsible for the existing hostility and strife between white and colored people. He remained on the legal committee of that radi-

cal organization until his appointment to the Supreme Court.

Frankfurter's affinity for radicals and radicalism was illustrated early in his career in his attitude toward the so-called Tom Mooney trials in San Francisco. Mooney, a labor agitator, with strong leanings toward the Bolsheviks of his day, had been convicted of first-degree murder, resulting from a brutal bombing in San Francisco which killed 10 people and wounded many others. Because of his Bolshevik connections, his conviction became an international incident.

In the Mooney proceedings, Frankfurter had a cloak to hide under. He had been appointed a mediators commissioner by President Wilson, and he operated from that base in the Mooney matter. He was unable to pull the wool over the eyes of former President Theodore Roosevelt, however. Roosevelt wrote him a letter, a part of which follows:

"MY DEAR MR. FRANKFURTER: I thank you for your frank letter. I answer it at length because you have taken, and are taking, on behalf of the administration an attitude which seems to me to be fundamentally that of Trotsky and other Bolshevik leaders in Russia; an attitude which may be fraught with mischief in this country."

While Frankfurter was professor of law at Harvard, and consorting with such characters as William Z. Foster, Robert M. Hutchins, and others of various shades of pink and red, he was also engaged in placing such men as Alger Hiss in positions in Washington. Hiss, first recommended to Washington by Frankfurter, had a meteoric rise which terminated in the penitentiary through a conviction of perjury which branded him as a Communist.

It is of some significance that Alger Hiss worked for Justice Reed when Reed was in the Justice Department. It is significant also that Reed and Frankfurter (then both Justices on the Supreme Court) went to New York to testify in behalf of Hiss as witnesses to his good character. It is significant also that the jury did not believe that testimony and convicted Hiss.

Justice Reed went on the Supreme Court bench in 1938. In a publication entitled "Current Biography," he is quoted as having this philosophy regarding the Supreme Court:

"If by interpretation based on moderation, social and economic experiments, we can advance steadily toward our objective, we can avoid dangerous experiments of fundamental constitutional change."

This philosophy indicates an intention to change our Constitution not by constitutional amendment as prescribed by the Constitution itself, but by interpretation based on modern social and economic experiments.

These men are representative of the moral fiber which makes up our present-day Supreme Court.

Another irresponsible radical on the Court who brazenly asserts the claim that instead of being bound by the language of the Constitution, the Supreme Court may change its meaning to conform to the Court's ideas of modern needs is William O. Douglas. These quotations from a book he recently wrote are typical of his contempt for the Constitution upon which our free government is based:

"In nations like America and India that have written Constitutions, the judiciary must do more than dispense justice in cases and controversies. It must also keep the charter of government current with the times and not allow it to become archaic or out of tune with the needs of today."

"Today's new decision becomes a coveted anchorage for new vested interests. . . . It then takes an oncoming group from a new generation to catch the broader vision which may require the undoing of the work of their predecessors."

Under such befuddled and fuzzy thinking as this, the Constitution would cease to

have any meaning whatever. If that conception were correct, then actually we have no Constitution at all. Its written words lose their meaning. The people would lose their power to control the Constitution by amendment, because that power of amendment would have been usurped completely by the nine men who sit in the Supreme Court.

The following activities further illustrate the philosophy of Douglas: He said in a speech at the University of Teheran that Iran needed to make sweeping reforms, and should adopt a program embracing perhaps 10-percent Communism, 15-percent capitalism, and 75-percent something else.

In 1952, he accepted a \$1,000 award given by the CIO, an organization having a constant interest in much of the litigation which reaches the Supreme Court.

He urged in Tokyo that the Western Powers recognize Red China in the United Nations and unseat Nationalist China from the Security Council.

He wrote a dissenting opinion when the 11 top Communists were convicted and carried their case to the Supreme Court. In his dissent, he wrote that the freedom of speech of these Communists who were convicted under the Smith Act, was violated.

Yet, he supported the Smith Act in the Steve Nelson case which tied the hands of the 48 States so far as communism is concerned. When the issue was whether 11 convicted Communists should be punished, Douglas dissented. When the issue centered around encroaching on State's rights, plus freeing another convicted Communist, Douglas affirmed.

June 17, 1953, the day before the atomic spies, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, were scheduled for execution, he entered a stay of execution and left town. His order was invalidated by the Court, and the Rosenbergs were executed, but it did provide time and opportunity for Communists the world over to work up demonstrations elevating the Rosenbergs to martyrdom, something the Communists always seek.

Time does not permit a complete discussion of the radical affiliations and activities of the Supreme Court personnel.

Of the entire Supreme Court as it exists today, only two members had judicial experience before appointment to the Court, unless service as a city recorder could be counted judicial experience. In that event, three of the present Supreme Court members had judicial experience before going upon the bench of the highest Court of our land. Obviously, in this present era politics and radicalism outweigh legal ability and judicial experience.

When our Supreme Court has upon its bench men who have not only been associates and well-wishers, but active participants in the programs of such organizations as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, American Civil Liberties Union, Americans for Democratic Action, what can we expect when the radical philosophies of these organizations come before the Court for approval or disapproval? The wonder is that our Constitution has survived as well as it has.

If our free, constitutional Republic is to survive, protection must be afforded from these who are destroying it, whether they be zealous fanatics or merely well-meaning judges, determined to force radical doctrines upon an unwilling, but helpless, citizenry. The danger is greater now than it was in the thirties when the Executive undertook to pack the Supreme Court with a personnel willing to upset established precedents and to change the meaning of our Constitution.

A storm of protest went up then. But that protest was against a proposal to pack the Court.

The Court has now been packed. Our task now is to see to it that this packed Court does not destroy our Constitution and our Republic.

The wisdom of the ages is contained in the body of the law. If the statute law is to be changed, these changes should be made by the legislative branch. If the Constitution is to be changed, such changes should be made only by amendment.

It cannot be repeated too often—the Supreme Court has no right or authority to change the law or amend the Constitution. One of the principal reasons that liberty has survived in America, while perishing in nearly every other section of the world, is that our Government has been a government of laws and not a government of men.

Our Constitution has been manhandled by political appointees, screened and approved by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and Americans for Democratic Action. Their practice has been, during their incumbency on the bench, to say the law is one thing today and something else tomorrow. They are destroying our Constitution and the rights of States and individuals, and we are being told that we must accept these outrageous and fraudulent violations of our constitutional rights—that we are helpless to resist them. I say that such is not the case.

Members of the bar are usually the first to take notice of any encroachment upon the rights of its citizens. The bar has been the first to resist improper use of authority or illegal exercise of powers. An aroused bar can do much toward requiring the Supreme Court to stay within its proper sphere, even though it may chafe with impatience at the somewhat slower approach of the millennium through constitutional channels.

Let me urge you, as members of our great profession, to take your place in this critical era, in this vital controversy, on the side of legal procedure and constitutional government.

TRAGIC FARCE CORRECTED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include pertinent matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the action taken by the United Nations in disbanding the so-called Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission in Korea is an action which should be commended by all freedom loving people because it strikes a hard blow at the international Communist conspiracy. Those of us who have had an opportunity to visit Korea and to review first-hand the activities that have taken place there since the so-called truce, know full well now this Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission was used by the Communists to further their nefarious ends.

Last November during the course of an inspection trip to the Far East I spent 5 days in Korea and during that time had the opportunity to see firsthand the evidence which demonstrated beyond any question of doubt that the representatives of Communist-occupied Poland and Communist-occupied Czechoslovakia were, in fact, espionage and propaganda agents for the Kremlin. Much of this evidence was made available to me by the late Maj. Gen. Kim Chang Young, Chief

of the Counterintelligence Corps of the Republic of Korea Army.

Last February General Kim was struck down by the bullets of assassins on the streets of Seoul, Korea, during the early morning hours. In a statement I made before the House on February 1, drawing attention to the death of General Kim, I had the following to say apropos the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission:

While in Korea, I heard a great deal of talk about the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission which was provided for in the so-called armistice arranged during the Communist war of aggression in Korea. As you know, that Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission is supposed to inspect and report on the armed truce which now hangs so heavily over the people of Korea. This Commission is in no sense, a neutral nations commission because it includes in its membership representation of Communist-occupied Poland and Communist-occupied Czechoslovakia. It will be recalled that India agreed to accept the Chair of this Commission when it was set up. But soon after when the deal proved to be phony, the Indian general acting as Chairman could no longer stomach the tragic farce which involved his nation and he accordingly resigned the chairmanship and took the Indian troops back to India. Consequently, there remain four member nations on this so-called Supervisory Commission; in addition to the Communist Czechs and Poles, there are the Swedes and the Swiss. Because of all the talk I heard about this so-called Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission, I asked General Kim for his opinion on the matter. He hesitated to answer me, and he told me that he did not want to embarrass any of the governments of the free world by expressing his opinion on this matter. I assured him that truth could never be a matter of embarrassment to the American people.

It was at this point that General Kim took me to a set of files and exhibits relating to the activities of the so-called Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission. In those files was an abundance of evidence of a documentary character together with pictures showing that the Communist Poles and Communist Czechs serving as members of this mission engaged in both espionage and propaganda activities. From the evidence collected by General Kim and his staff, I have no doubt whatever but that the Communist world conspiracy regards the so-called Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission in Korea as nothing more than an instrument through which they can carry out espionage and propaganda. I need not add that our own military security officers were not in disagreement with the evaluation given to me by General Kim on this all-important question. It is to be regretted that the representatives of Switzerland and Sweden have continued to lend themselves to this tragic farce which only makes more difficult the task of enforcing the peace and bringing about eventual unity of Korea under one government, representative of the will of the people.

It is indeed encouraging to hear that the United Nations has discharged the so-called Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission and in doing so, announced to the world that it was not only a tragic farce, but that the Communist conspirators have been using it as a cover to the preparation of a wide range of activities which can lead only to a reopening of the war of Communist aggression in Korea. It is also noteworthy that the United Nations rejected the proposal of Red China for the opening of discussions on a final settlement in Korea.

The United Nations has rightfully found that the Chinese Communists are guilty of aggression in connection with the Korean war. It naturally follows that the United Nations would refuse to lift this condemnation by engaging in fruitless discussions with the Red Chinese on a settlement in Korea. The United Nations are to be congratulated for taking positive action to prevent any further damage to the cause of the free world by the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission in Korea.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 11544) to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

FAILURE OF CONGRESS TO INVESTIGATE ACTIVITIES OF RACKETEERS AND EXTORTIONISTS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, yesterday on the television program Meet the Press, Victor Riesel took occasion to criticize the Congress because it had failed to investigate the activities of racketeers and extortionists who were bringing so much trouble and disgrace to legitimate labor organizations.

In his opinion the acid assault upon him was the result of his exposure of the racketeers and extortionists who have forced their way into unions which they now dominate.

In my judgment, his opinion and his criticism of the Congress was justified because heretofore on both sides of the aisle there has been opposition which seems to be dictated by fear of political retaliation from labor organizations, to any suggestion that the Congress make any investigation such as Mr. Riesel indicated should be made.

Well do I recall that in the Eightieth Congress, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor and also as a member of the Committee on Government Operations, then known as the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, we undertook to expose some of these racketeers who were doing so much to injure the cause of organized labor. But we were shut off by individuals who were rather prominent in the political organization of the Republican Party, and there were some in the Democratic Party, not so many but some.

Of course, they, the Democrats, were more effective because in political organizations and in political maneuvering they have more ability than we have or else more courage or something, perhaps less regard for the methods they use than do we. They really go to town when they have charge of the organization. You have to hand it to them. That is why we got licked politically so often—that and their willingness to promise anything and everything regardless of their ability or willingness to deliver.

In the 83d Congress, an effort was made by me to iron out some difficulties on the question of jurisdiction that might arise between those two committees if an investigation such as suggested by Mr. Riesel was undertaken. It was my privilege to be a member of both.

At my request, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor did appoint a 3-man committee headed by our colleague from Kansas, WINT SMITH, and of which I was a member. It was my privilege to appoint a similar committee from the Committee on Government Operations. We held joint hearings in Detroit. We were well on the way toward exposing some of these racketeers, but at that time some Republicans stopped us again.

Later on, when the investigation got around to where it might reflect some discredit on the Governor of Indiana, who happened to be a Republican—I just happened to think of that just as this moment as a Republican from Indiana passed by—they stopped us once more. I recall that on that particular occasion our colleague from Kansas, Mr. SMITH, who was chairman of the joint committee, went out of the hearing room to answer a call from Washington. He came back and he said it was all off; we could not go ahead with anything that might involve the Governor of Indiana. One of the newspaper boys asked him who had called him out and he said, "Somebody away up there," and he pointed to the sky. Which ended that proposed investigation.

Later on the Committee on Government Operations, getting a little sore at me because of my crudeness and lack of finesse—I was so dumb I thought we should actually economize as well as talk economy, I do not know just what it is—took away my authority to go ahead with that investigation of racketeering. I had been advised when I went to Detroit that it might involve Jimmy Haffa, of the teamsters. You have all heard about him. If you have not, consult your labor directory and you will find him listed as the boss. Do not misunderstand me. I am not charging that Jimmy is taking any graft. He does not need to. His legitimate income from the union of which he is president is tremendous. He has on occasion hidden behind his wife's skirts and by forcing some of his union boys out of business aided her to a few thousand dollars' profit without much, if any, effort on her part. One of the unions of which he is president authorized him to spend as much of \$4 million for political campaign purposes as he might desire.

May I say to my colleague from Illinois, Mr. O'HARA, that he should thank the

good Lord Jimmy does not live in your district. With your views, if you would not take his orders—I know you would not—he would be after you come election day. Anyway, some of those who engineered that job of putting us off, or at least had something to do with it, did not win, even on a Republican ticket at that time. And so it has been all along. Political fear of a union boss who had no real political control of union votes has been effective.

I hope that the House will take cognizance of the present situation, because Victor Riesel has certainly paid a price for his opposition to those gangsters and their activities which no individual should be called upon to pay, which others will pay if the House does not have the courage to act. Perhaps now, because, being a member of the press or associated with the press, Victor is in a position to call for action and to make it so imperative, so necessary that we do something, maybe we will get a real investigation, something long overdue.

I hope we will, and I hope the Republicans will have a hand in it, and instead of cutting off this investigation as they did in the 80th and the 83d Congress and then giving the other group over there, with a Democrat at the head, an opportunity to go on, and they have, get the credit for an investigation which will clean up the present troubled situation.

I do not know why, as long as our position has always been known, we do not get a little of the credit which would come out of a fair, decent, effective investigation of those lawless oppressive activities.

The assault upon Riesel is an assault upon the right of a free press and free speech. As a matter of fact, neither party has anything to fear from the opposition of the labor leaders. That is true because the vast overwhelming majority of the members of the unions are just as honest and decent as the members of any other group. And they are just as independent, and I know in my own district they do not take the word of the boss as to how their vote should be cast. Actually the labor leaders so-called have little political power except as they use union funds to influence elections.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I heard the broadcast yesterday on Meet the Press, as the gentleman did. It was my understanding from what Mr. Riesel said that George Meany and Walter Reuther had spoken out against these racketeers in labor, and as I understood it they were willing for such an investigation to be conducted. Now, I do not know whether that was to be a congressional investigation or not, but it was my understanding that he stated on two occasions in that interview that both Meany and Reuther were against this kind of a policy. Now, was that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, that was my understanding of what he said, but I do not go along with his views

on Walter Reuther on that. As to Meany, I have not the slightest doubt in my mind, from what I have known of his record, that he wants to get rid of the gangsters in the union organization. From what I know of Walter Reuther's record, he does not, and I will tell you why.

In the recent Kohler strike over in Sheboygan, Wis., not so long ago, what position did Walter take? He sent his righthand man, Emil Mazey, over there to engineer the strikers' activities. They, the pickets, disregarded all law, violated or decried the civil rights of all who opposed them. Mazey is the boy who stands back, and I know this from previous investigations at Dowagiac, Mich., at St. Joe, Mich., and at Clinton, Mich. This man Mazey, who is Reuther's righthand man, is the general on the spot; he is just as yellow as a man can be, and just as lawless. We had him on the witness stand. We know of his activities. Here is what he usually did—at least, he did in this case: He stands back and he tells the pickets, sometimes professional pickets, goons many times, wearing those iron hats, sometimes with a dumbbell, an iron one, in the hand this way, backing up to the plate-glass windows, as they did in Detroit when the strike was on against the automobile dealers, smashing the windows in back of them; he tells the pickets to go ahead, encourages them to do the actual fighting. Mazey stands back and encourages them to go on. Then, when some of the fellows who follow his advice get caught by the police, that is, one of the pickets, big, brave Mazey is in the clear. And he testified at St. Joe—he had to admit it—he testified at St. Joe he had been arrested many times; but he boasted proudly of the fact that he had never been convicted, which he had not up to that time. He is always the bird that is back behind, a yellow individual who has no regard for the law, who incites violence, but hides back in the crowd. He lacks the courage to do his own dirty work. Unfortunately for him, over at Sheboygan he went a little too far afield, and they nailed him and they convicted him, and that, as I understand, was the first time.

While we are on the subject, and so that my Democratic friends will not get too much credit for the Senate investigation to which Riesel referred, I want to call their attention to the fact that when a man named Flynn was convicted at St. Joe, Mich., and in spite of the fact that many automobiles have been damaged during strikes, and when the jury found that the damage was enough to make the offense a felony and the judge sent him to State's prison, one of the great candidates—you better strike the "great"—one of the candidates for the Democratic presidential nomination, our governor, Mr. Williams, pardoned him shortly thereafter, and within 2 weeks the pardoned violator of the law was down on the picket line at Sturgis, Mich. In this Sheboygan strike one of Reuther's and Mazey's boys went over there and beat up one of the workers. I do not recall whether the man died or not, but, in any event, there was a fugitive warrant sent out for him after he es-

caped to Michigan. Governor Williams was protecting the crook—I withdraw "crook"—the alleged crook and refused to send him back to Wisconsin for trial. As I understand it, the Federal court has ordered him to appear before the National Labor Relations Board and testify on a matter pending before the Board. Whether Wisconsin will get him for trial on the criminal charge I do not know. Williams says the man would not get a fair trial in Wisconsin if returned there. Of course, that is all nonsense. If Williams tried him—he would not try him; he would issue him a pardon in advance. What Williams is doing is making Michigan a State of refuge for those charged with crime committed in another State. So when you say Reuther wants to clean up, I say no; he does not want to clean up; he never has wanted to clean up. He has been a party all the time, since December of 1937, to encouraging violence in Michigan. He was in the sit-down strikes in 1937. He was one of the boys on the overpass in the Ford Detroit strike, where he and Frankenstein took a licking because they underestimated the physical ability of the workers. Just read what I put in the Record about Walter Reuther. He is the bird who went to Russia to get part of his education—he and his brother Victor. He is the bird who wrote back that letter from Russia to some of the workers in Detroit in which he said, "Fight for a Soviet America." Do not put any credence in Walter Reuther or Emil Mazey or any of the leaders of their goon squads.

Meany? Yes; if given the authority, I think he will clean house. But Reuther? No; and he will prevent Meany doing a job if he can. Hundreds of thousands of loyal workers, members of unions, want to go along with law enforcement. That is what my mail indicates and has indicated over the years. It has been that way all the time. There are only a few, just a sprinkling here and there, who are doing the dirty work and who are bringing discredit upon the unions.

PRESSURE ON CERTAIN IMMIGRANTS TO RETURN TO THE COUNTRY OF THEIR ORIGIN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, during the last several weeks there have paraded before a committee of the United States Senate a number of aliens who have been telling a most unusual and harrowing story concerning the attempts being made by the Iron Curtain countries to persuade these people to return home. Many of them are afraid because they say that they made misrepresentations when they came into the United States and are fearful lest they be deported.

At the time the basic Immigration and Nationality Code was drafted, in 1952, the conferees of the House and Senate

knew all about those people who had made misrepresentations as to the place of their birth at the time they left the continent of Europe. Many of these people swore that they were born in countries other than Russia because we at that moment were parties to the forcible repatriation program, a terrible blot on our history. These people knew that if they were sent back to Communist Russia they would suffer in many respects.

As a matter of fact, I was at a camp in Germany when a Russian repatriation team was interrogating people there endeavoring to prevail upon them to go home. I asked the Russian colonel in charge of the team what success he was having. He smiled and said, "Two have been prevailed upon to leave this camp." I then said to him, "They are afraid to go to Russia." And he said, "Well, they know that they have much to answer to."

These are the people who later swore that they came from places other than Russia when they made their application for admission to the United States. But with that knowledge before the conference committee we wrote in our report and in section 243 (h) of the Code broad enough language under which the Attorney General of the United States can withhold deportation so that these people may come forward and tell the truth as to the places of their birth instead of continuing the lie under which they came to the United States. We have broadened this authority recently in the bill H. R. 6888, which has already passed the House.

I do not know what you have to do to call to the attention of the Attorney General of the United States this section 243 (h) of the law, but there it is. In the conference report, part of which I wrote myself, we spelled out this situation. I sincerely trust that the Attorney General of the United States in his wisdom will send to the immigration districts the necessary information so that these people who are in the United States unlawfully because of this technicality may remain in this country as they so fervently desire to do.

WALTER REUTHER AND BROTHERHOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have a very deep personal affection for the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, who represents the district in which I was born. Ours is a friendship that transcends differences in political convictions and in philosophies. I regret that my good friend on this primary day, when we have little legislative business and plenty of time on our hands, felt moved to spread a feast of joyance in the laps of those on his side of the aisle who easily are tickled into hilarity by verbal brickbats hurled at the champions of labor and the upholders of the rights and dignity of men and women who toil in the trades and crafts. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan, who

never is dull, surpassed himself in this feast of joyance, in honor I take it, and lacking any better reason, of primary day in Iowa.

Seated in the Chamber listening was the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], and when she heard Mr. Reuther mentioned in manner disrespectful of Mr. Reuther's great and overshadowing contribution to the better world in which we live, and mentioned also of one of the great governors that my native State of Michigan has ever had, the present governor of Michigan, the gentlewoman from Oregon wished and prepared to reply; but duty was calling her to her committee and she had to leave, so I ask unanimous consent that her remarks may be extended immediately following my remarks here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was on another matter that I asked time, not a matter of personalities, but to bring to this House a message of good cheer from the great Second Congressional District of Illinois. It does have, however, a relationship to the subject of the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan, since one of the causes to which Mr. Reuther and the great governor of Michigan have devoted themselves is that of brotherhood.

Yesterday, in Woodlawn, in the heart of the district that I represent, a new minister came to the 59-year-old Sixth United Presbyterian Church, a church that in these 59 years had had no worshiper not of the white race. The new minister that came yesterday to preside over that flock is a Negro, the Reverend Abraham Lincoln Reynolds, Jr., called by the vote of a white congregation.

Integration in the great Second District of Illinois is an accomplished fact. By reaching for brotherhood we have attained it.

I am sure my colleagues will be interested in and heartened by the account of the coming of the Reverend Mr. Reynolds to the Woodlawn Church, as told in the following news article from the Chicago Sun-Times of June 4, 1956:

NEGRO CLERIC FILLS WOODLAWN PULPIT

(By Dolores McCahill)

"You know without a question the Sixth (Woodlawn) United Presbyterian Church is integrated," the new pastor said in presenting his family.

The introduction was made Sunday by Dr. A. L. Reynolds, Jr., new Negro pastor of the church at 62d and Woodlawn, on behalf of his wife Louise and their two sons, Leroy and Abraham Lincoln Reynolds III.

After preaching his first sermon to his new congregation, Dr. Reynolds received into its membership the first two members of his race other than his own family.

FIFTY-NINE-YEAR-OLD CHURCH

The congregation, which previously numbered 159 whites and a girl with Japanese ancestry, decided to call a Negro minister to show that Negroes would be welcome in the 59-year-old church. It stands on a street which has a number of Negro residents.

The church met overflow success in its attempt to attract Negroes to the service. For the first time since Easter of 1952, sliding panels were raised so that worshippers unable

to find places in the pews could participate in the service from the Sunday school assembly room at the side.

Attendance had been from 50 to 65 on Sundays for the past 4 months, while 263 persons came to Dr. Reynolds' first sermon. The chief usher, Alexander Stevenson, estimated the congregation to be about 60 percent Negro and 40 percent white. Dr. Reynolds from his pulpit thought he saw more Negroes than whites though he hadn't been thinking in those terms.

Extending the invitation to membership, the minister said "We are a group of people here who only see people. I can't help but believe the Saviour of us all smiles this morning as we work together in His name and for His cause."

Those who joined yesterday were David G. Hayes of 6431 South University, a real estate agent, and Mrs. George W. Prince of 6136 South Greenwood, substitute high school teacher.

BELIEVED PRECEDENCE

Officers of the Sixth United Presbyterian Church believe it was the first white congregation in Chicago to bring a Negro to its pastorate. It is thought to be the second United Presbyterian congregation in the country to adopt a program of interracial membership. One in St. Louis already had done so, they said.

Asked whether he regarded the new interracial character of his congregation as permanent or transitional, Dr. Reynolds said: "My aim is to serve the community. If the entire community becomes of one race, quite naturally the church would. But our doors are open to any nationality."

The minister previously served Mount Olive Methodist Church in Topeka, Kan., a Negro congregation. He chose Horizons Unlimited as the theme of his initial sermon here, telling the church members they shared "a challenge to lift our hearts by prayer, love, faith, and understanding."

The Chicago Tribune of June 4, 1956, gives the following account:

NEGRO PASTOR IN PULPIT OF WHITE CHURCH

The Sixth United Presbyterian church, 6161 Woodlawn avenue, the first white congregation in Chicago to appoint a Negro as its pastor May 11, became an integrated congregation yesterday.

The Reverend Dr. Abraham Lincoln Reynolds, Jr., 49, formerly of Topeka, Kans., assumed his pastorate at the 11 a. m. service. More than 300 persons, half of them Negroes, worshiped together in reciting psalms and singing hymns. An all white choir of 14 sang in the chancel, but whites and Negroes shared ushering assignments.

RECALLS CHRIST'S ORDER

Dr. Reynolds said in the invocation that "all men are created in the image of God," and recalled in the Scripture reading from the 16th chapter of St. Mark that Christ ordered his disciples to "preach the gospel to every living creature."

"There are some men who say all men and women cannot live and worship together," the pastor said. "But a Man who lived on this earth 1,900 years ago said it can be done."

During the service, Dr. Reynolds introduced his wife, Louise, and two children, Theon Le Roy, 11, and A. L. III, 8, to the congregation. A reception for the Reynolds family will be held in the church Friday night.

MANY LEAVE NEIGHBORHOOD

After the service, parishioners introduced themselves to each other. Monroe McMackin, sessions clerk of the church, explained that because of displacement of white families by Negro families, members living in the neighborhood had shrunk from 250 to 7 families although dozens who had

moved away continued to attend services.

After the congregation voted to keep the church in its present location the missions board of the United Presbyterian church assisted in the search for a pastor. Meanwhile parishioners began a canvass of the neighborhood in invite Negroes to attend the 59-year-old church.

First of the new parishioners to sign membership cards yesterday was David G. Hayes, 33, of 6431 University Avenue, a real estate salesman.

ECONOMIC AID IN THE MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, the Mutual Security Act of 1956 will come to the floor next Wednesday. I thought it might be helpful to explain in advance some of the provisions in the bill which have not received much attention. There has been a great deal of discussion about the military part of this bill. Perhaps we forget that most of the money authorized in the bill is for economic aid of various kinds.

Of the \$3,563,475,000 total, \$1,550,700,000 is for furnishing military weapons, equipment and training; \$2,012,775,000 is for other purposes. This year, economic aid for direct forces support in the amount of \$374,300,000 was carried in the general military assistance request of \$2,925,000,000. Even though this request has been cut to \$1,925,000,000 in section 2 of the bill, I understand that the Executive is not planning to cut the spending for direct forces support, which is economic aid—food, clothing, gasoline, and so forth, for the support of troops.

Thus the authorizations for economic aid in the bill are as follows:

[In millions]

Direct forces support.....	\$374.3
Defense support.....	1,147.7
Development assistance.....	243.0
Technical cooperation.....	157.5
Other programs.....	90.3
Total (rounded).....	2,012.8

The first two items are for support of military effort. Every item is designed to promote our own security. Most of the money authorized, however, is for economic aid, not weapons and training. The amount for guaranties is increased \$400 million in the bill, but is a contingent item and therefore is not shown as an increased authorization in the totals. If we add this amount to the authorizations available for economic aid under this bill, the total would be \$2,412,800,000 for economic aid compared to \$1,550,700,000 for strictly military aid.

LONG-TERM AID

This bill involves a considerable reappraisal of the Executive requests for economic aid, especially as to long-term aid to underdeveloped countries.

Recently, as part of their "new look," the Soviets have been offering technical assistance and economic aid to undeveloped countries.

We have been doing this for a number of years. A number of such programs are contained in existing law. The

President's Fund for Asian Development was created last year, for \$200 million to remain available until June 30, 1958. Development assistance was authorized in title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, with separate amounts for the Near East and Africa, Asia, and the Western Hemisphere.

This year's requests included a special authorization for the Middle East and Africa of \$100 million, and specific longer-term commitments for economic development up to 10 years of not to exceed \$100 million in any 1 year from any new funds made available.

The committee reappraised this program. There is no termination date in the mutual security law and therefore any amendment expressed in terms of years would be shorter in duration technically speaking than the law it amended. We also realize that no Congress can pass a law its successor cannot amend or repeal.

Therefore the committee adopted a carefully worded statement of policy—see section 7 of the bill—of continuing aid to free nations as long as this danger to the peace of the world and our own security persists, and then rearranged and combined the various programs of development assistance by an amendment I offered.

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

Assistance for economic development of their resources has been furnished to many countries in the past, including countries carrying on military programs as part of their defense support—see title I. This can be done under the present bill. In recent years, however, the words "development assistance" have come to have a special meaning; substantial economic aid in addition to technical assistance in countries which do not have military programs in the common defense. This applies especially to underdeveloped countries.

This year a number of separate programs of this character were requested. The requests were for \$370 million, as follows:

President's Asian fund..... \$100,000,000

Title II—Development assistance:

Near East and Africa.....	63,000,000
Asia.....	80,000,000
Latin America.....	27,000,000

Total title II..... 170,000,000

Middle East..... 100,000,000

Development assistance request..... 370,000,000

We put the request for Latin America in title I—defense support, as being more appropriate for neighbors who are joined together in treaties for defense against communism, even though they may not be carrying on joint military programs. We increased this amount by \$5 million. This left \$370 million in the development assistance category, as follows:

Development assistance request.....	\$370,000,000
Deduct Latin America (transferred).....	27,000,000

Development assistance request..... 343,000,000

We reduced this total request by \$100 million and, in section 4 of the bill, authorized \$243 million, to remain available until June 30, 1960, for economic development in free Asia, the Middle East and Africa. We did not divide the amount among these regions, but not more than 25 percent is to go any one nation. All of it is to be in loans or surplus agricultural commodities, except for regional projects involving 2 or more nations. We wish to encourage regional projects, but although the present law requires preference for such programs in the Asian fund, we learned—hearings, page 453—that only one-third of the \$66.6 million programed is for regional projects.

LOANS

The present law provides in 3 places that the program "shall emphasize loans rather than grants, wherever possible." The efforts this year have been "disappointing," to quote Mr. Hollister, Director of ICA—hearings, page 49—probably about the same as last year's \$209 million.

The requirements of the development assistance section should improve this record.

The Soviets furnish all of their economic aid, except for technical assistance, in the form of loans or barter deals. There is little or nothing in the record to show that we need to make outright grants to compete with them in neutral underdeveloped countries.

There is a popular misconception, stimulated by banking minds and by giveaway enthusiasts, that aid loans amount to grants, are never paid, and create hard feelings.

The record is otherwise. For instance, we received last year \$502 million in principal and \$273 million in interest on foreign-aid loans made since World War II according to the Department of Commerce. About one-fifth of our post-war aid of \$5 billion has been in credits. Under the mutual-security program and its predecessors 50 loans to 23 countries, totaling about \$1,868,000,000 have been made. This year \$15,126,672 is being paid on principal and \$37,651,945 in interest on these loans.

We are becoming a have-not country in essential raw materials. Any long-term development plans for other countries should include long-term repayments which can be made in raw materials we will need increasingly. This bill stresses this policy.

GUARANTIES

This bill—section 6 (k)—provides authority to guarantee \$400 million in private investments by an amendment I offered, in addition to the estimated \$100 million which will be issued by June 30. A fractional reserve is set up, in line with insurance practice instead of a 100 percent reserve. In addition to insuring convertibility of currencies, and against expropriation or confiscation, coverage may include losses caused by war, revolution, and insurrection.

Up to date we have had no losses on investment guarantees, and the reserve is maintained by issuance of notes which do not require appropriations. Over \$293 million in applications are now

pending. We charge a fee for guaranties. Our whole foreign-aid program is to assure that we will not have a war, and that we will end up with a peaceful free world where people respect private property and pay their debts. If we can secure private investment in underdeveloped countries by charging a fee to protect the investor against the risks we have spent billions to prevent, we can cut the amount of Government-aid programs.

Up to date, Government officials and bureaucrats here and abroad, and also businessmen here and abroad, when given the choice of grants, loans, or guaranties in foreign-aid programs, have usually chosen grants. In this case, flexibility has been expensive. When the choice has been loans or nothing, they choose loans. As grant money has been reduced, interest in guaranties has increased. By tightening up on grants, but opening up on loans and guaranties, for economic development, we hope to encourage a long-term policy that will involve private investment costing our Government nothing, or loans, where we are repaid. That is the capitalistic system that developed our country and most of the free world. We believe it is better than the Communist system, and will prove itself in competition.

AMENDMENTS TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODES OF 1939 AND 1954

Mr. COOPER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7247) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and for other purposes.

CERTAIN RAILROAD REORGANIZATIONS AND INSOLVENCY PROCEEDINGS

Mr. COOPER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6143) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and for other purposes.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, for 10 minutes, on today.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. WILLIS), on Thursday, for 30 minutes.

Mr. IKARD, on tomorrow, for 30 minutes.
Mr. BAILEY, on tomorrow, for 20 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois and to include an outstanding address by Mr. FEIGHAN.

Mr. WALTER and include an address he delivered at the national convention, notwithstanding the estimated cost will amount to \$287.

Mr. KEARNS on the bill H. R. 10424.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOEVEN.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan and include an editorial.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2048. An act for the relief of certain former employees of the Inland Waterways Corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2771. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use at the Fourth National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2772. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in England in 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore:

H. R. 1671. An act for the relief of Clement E. Sprouse;

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Elizabeth Doherty;

H. R. 2216. An act to amend the Act of June 19, 1948 (ch. 511, 62 Stat. 489), relating to the retention in the service of disabled commissioned officers and warrant officers of the Army and Air Force;

H. R. 3996. An act to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945;

H. R. 4229. An act to provide running mates for certain staff corps officers in the naval service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4437. An act relating to withholding for State employee retirement system purposes, on the compensation of certain civilian employees of the National Guard and the Air National Guard;

H. R. 4569. An act to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes;

H. R. 4704. An act to provide for the examination preliminary to promotion of officers of the naval service;

H. R. 5268. An act to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the payment of mileage allowance for overland travel by private conveyance outside the continental limits of the United States;

H. R. 7679. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the city of Muskogee, Okla.;

H. R. 8477. An act to amend title II of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, by providing flexibility in the distribution of women officers in the grades of commander and lieutenant commander, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8490. An act authorizing the administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Bonham, Tex.;

H. R. 8674. An act to provide for the return of certain property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.;

H. R. 9358. An act to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to issue a deed to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for certain land heretofore conveyed to such city, removing the conditions and reservations made a part of such prior conveyance; and

H. R. 10251. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to deed certain land to the city of Grand Junction, Colo.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 5, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1918. A letter from the president, the bar association of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to prescribe administrative procedure for the government of the District of Columbia, to require the maintenance of an official publication for said government, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1919. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of December 2, 1942, and the act of August 16, 1941, relating to injury, disability, and death resulting from war-risk hazards and from employment, suffered by employees of contractors of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1920. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to increase the fees of witnesses in the United States courts and before United States commissioners, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1921. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 752 of title 28 of the United States Code"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 31, 1956, the following bills were reported June 1, 1956:

Mr. GORDON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 10766. A bill to authorize the payment of compensation for certain losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces during World War II, with amendment (Rept. No. 2251). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOPER: Committee of Conference. H. R. 7247. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of gain in certain railroad reorganizations (Rept. No. 2252). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COOPER: Committee of Conference. H. R. 6143. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue

Code of 1939 to provide that for taxable years beginning after May 31, 1950, certain amounts received in consideration of the transfer of patent rights shall be considered capital gain regardless of the basis upon which such amounts are paid (Rept. No. 2253). Ordered to be printed.

[Submitted June 4, 1956]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 521. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 1840, a bill to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination; without amendment (Rept. No. 2254). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 11544. A bill to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2512. An act to amend the Act of August 27, 1954, so as to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of certain members of the Armed Forces who died or were killed while serving in such forces; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2257). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 9828. A bill to transfer 600 acres of public domain to the Kanosh Band of Indians, Utah; without amendment (Rept. No. 2258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 11522. A bill to implement section 25 (b) of the Organic Act of Guam by carrying out the recommendations of the Commission on the Application of Federal Laws to Guam, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2259). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7888. A bill to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands located at Wellwell, Island of Kauai, to certain claimants; without amendment (Rept. No. 2255). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 8005. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the Mathew American Horse American Legion Post No. 259, Cannon Ball, N. Dak., of certain lands upon the Standing Rock Reservation, N. Dak., for use as a site for the erection of a memorial monument in honor of soldiers killed in battle; with amendment (Rept. No. 2256). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:
H. R. 11569. A bill to provide for effecting the disposition of the Illinois and Mississippi

Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 11570. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to fisheries and wildlife; to strengthen the fisheries and wildlife segments of the national economy; to create and establish within the Department of the Interior the office of Under Secretary of Fisheries and Wildlife, a Fisheries Service and a Wildlife Service; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 11571. A bill to incorporate the Boys' Clubs of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 11572. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place marine sextants on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois:

H. R. 11573. A bill to promote the progress of medicine and to advance the national health and welfare by creating a National Library of Medicine to be located in Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 11574. A bill to amend paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368), as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H. R. 11575. A bill to provide for an Assistant Secretary for Research and Development for each of the three military departments within the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 11576. A bill to amend part III of subchapter O of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 11577. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Older Persons within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PRIEST (by request):

H. R. 11578. A bill to amend section 610 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the imposition of civil penalties in certain additional cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 11579. A bill to establish a Federal Recreation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 11580. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the safety functions of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 11581. A bill to provide for registration, reporting, and disclosure of employee welfare and pension benefit plans; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 11582. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act and the Communist Control Act of 1954 so as to provide for a passport review procedure and to prohibit the issuance of passports to persons going or staying abroad to support the Communist movement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY (by request):

H. J. Res. 632. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell the T2-SE-A2 tankers, *Mission San Antonio* and *Mission De Pala*; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:

H. Res. 522. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Ways and Means to inves-

tigate and study tariff and trade laws, regulations, practices, and policies, with reference to their effect on industry, labor, and agriculture in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. Hiestand:

H. Res. 523. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of labor racketeering in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. Cretella:

H. R. 11583. A bill for the relief of Denise Curkan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Cunningham:

H. R. 11584. A bill for the relief of Estelle Carlson as guardian of Hulda Ahlberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Gross:

H. R. 11585. A bill for the relief of Plutarco Pecina Sierra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMillan:

H. R. 11586. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Cornelia W. Heiss, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Mahon:

H. R. 11587. A bill for the relief of Shakeeb Dakour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Pelly:

H. R. 11588. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Norberta Cueto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Radwan:

H. R. 11589. A bill for the relief of O. J. Glenn & Son, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Rogers of Colorado:

H. R. 11590. A bill for the relief of Harry N. Duff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Walter:

H. R. 11591. A bill for the relief of Antonio Murgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Con. Res. 246. Concurrent resolution approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1098. By Mr. Bush: Petition of John Q. Timbrell and 90 residents of Bloomsburg and Columbia County, Pa., urging immediate

enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1099. By Mr. Siler: Petition of Dr. David A. Cavin, president, Baptist Bible Fellowship, Springfield, Mo., and Jesse M. Seaver, director, Carolina Christian Union, Roanoke Rapids, N. C., on behalf of some 1,800 delegates and members of the Baptist Bible Fellowship at their annual national meeting at Springfield, Mo., urging enactment of the Siler bill, H. R. 4627, and the Langer bill, S. 923, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1100. Also, petition of Dr. David A. Cavin, president, Baptist Bible Fellowship, Springfield, Mo., and Jesse M. Seaver, director, Carolina Christian Union, Roanoke Rapids, N. C., on behalf of some 1,800 delegates and members of the Baptist Bible Fellowship at their annual national meeting at Springfield, Mo., urging the Congress to approve House Joint Resolution 312, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and which is known as the Christian amendment resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Water and Land Conservation and Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. Brooks of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to present a brilliant address delivered to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress at its 43d annual convention at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on May 11, 1956. Senator Stuart Symington, former Secretary of the Air Force, presents in a most able and constructive manner the problems of water utilization throughout the United States and gives, as far as I know, for the first time his views on what may be the No. 1 internal problem within our country.

The speech is as follows:

I welcome this opportunity to discuss one of the Nation's most urgent problems—the conservation and use of our water and land resources.

History shows that every civilization which has risen to world prominence has done so only in areas where the soil was fertile; and where pure water was abundant.

It was not by coincidence that man's first cities were built along the fertile banks of the Tigris-Euphrates River in Mesopotamia; and along the Nile River in Egypt.

These areas were the "cradles" of early civilization.

It is a historical fact that no nation has long maintained a leading world position after either its soil or water supply became depleted.

As illustration, Rome was perhaps the proudest of all ancient empires.

But by the second century A. D. that Empire had become so impotent agriculturally

the historian, Simkovitch, was moved to write:

"Province after province was conquered by Rome to feed the growing proletariat . . . Latium, Campania, Sardinia, Sicily, Spain, Northern Africa, as Roman granaries were successively reduced to exhaustion. Abandoned land in Latium and Campania turned into swamps; Northern Africa into a desert. The forest-clad hills were denuded."

In other words, when the Roman Empire became an agricultural parasite, like all other parasites, it perished when its sources of food became exhausted.

History's greatest lesson may be the fact adequate water and land are prerequisites not only to improved living standards but also to national survival.

When the United States was first settled some 350 years ago timber, water, and rich soil existed in great abundance.

But the population grew steadily and the consumption of soil products and water steadily increased; and therefore shortly after the year 1900 we realized that shortages were possible even in America.

As a result President Theodore Roosevelt initiated the Nation's first conservation program.

Then came World War I with its tremendous drain on our productive capacity; and later the gigantic growth in our industrial complex during the 1920's.

By the early 1930's the complete exhaustion of our natural land and water resources could be foreseen; and so, under the leadership of another Roosevelt, our Government undertook to carry out the greatest reclamation, conservation, and resources development program ever conceived in all history.

Vast tracts of arid desert became areas of fertile productivity. Denuded hills were reforested. Depleted agricultural plains were first fertilized and then sown in grass and grain. Multiple-purpose reservoirs were constructed.

This was a program to preserve our greatest heritage—the soil and water of America.

With the exception of the air we breathe, water is the material most vital to human life. It is the largest single controlling factor

in the growth of population, in the growth of industry, and in the growth of agriculture.

Because we of America were particularly blessed with an initial abundance of fresh water, we can only blame ourselves for that lack of foresight which in turn now forces us to face up to this impending water shortage.

As our population increases we must devote ever more attention to the elimination of water waste through uncontrolled floods, lack of conservation practices, and stream pollution.

In all probability within 20 years water will be the most critical scarcity of all our national resources.

According to the Hoover Commission, in 1975 water consumption will be 1½ times greater than it was in 1950, but in 1950 we were already suffering serious water shortages in many areas, a trend that is increasing each year.

Last fall the chief of the fish and game division of the Missouri Conservation Commission warned about this problem, as follows:

"Approximately three-fourths of the earth's surface is water, one-fourth land. I contend that the Lord made the earth that way because that is the relative importance of the two. Regardless of what anyone may believe, however, the fact remains that life on this earth, in all its forms and facets, has developed and must live accordingly.

"Water is our most important resource. The available supply of fresh, pure water is an absolute deadline beyond which no community, state, or nation can ever go. When humanity runs out of clean water everything stops—that is the end of the road for man and all his activities."

The growing domestic, industrial, irrigation, and power needs for water make imperative the adoption of a national water policy which will insure the development of our new water supplies.

To that end the following six steps, some now being taken haltingly, some not at all, should be followed resolutely:

There should be a coordinated program of flood control, water storage, and power development through the construction of multiple-purpose reservoirs, wherever feasible, on the water arteries of the Nation.

There should be a cooperative national and State program for organization and development of local watershed districts to control water runoff at its source. This would conserve and preserve a supply of fresh water on the land where it falls.

There should be a strong program of stream pollution control. That control should embody, first, provisions for interstate cooperation in the control and prevention of stream pollution; and, second, Federal grants-in-aid to towns and cities for the construction of sewage treatment plants, along with other water purification facilities.

There should be a cooperative national and State program for the reclamation of used water by the removal of waste and the use of purification processes.

There should be a cooperative national and State program for the development of new ground water reservoirs. This would tap the presently unavailable underground lakes and streams.

There should be a national research program designed to investigate the possibility of inducing rainfall through artificial means, the development of a practical method of removing salt from sea water, and the development of methods to use fresh water substitutes in industrial and agricultural production.

Unless we follow through on a positive program of this type, in the not too distant future we will find ourselves as a Nation in the position of the throat-parched ancient mariner who cried, "Water, water, everywhere—but not a drop to drink."

Now is also the time to give serious consideration to the problem of how to conserve our native soil, and make it more productive.

Each year millions of tons of our best soil are eroded by rivers and streams.

Add to this the tons of topsoil eroded by the wind of our western plains, and we begin to calculate how many acres of agricultural productivity are sacrificed each year through natural causes alone.

For many decades, farmers in this country, schooled in the tradition of their fathers and grandfathers persisted in the raising of the same crops on the same soil. As a result, the once fertile topsoil has been depleted of its regenerative powers; and in many cases each year the crop yield becomes less and less.

Despite this continuing loss and depletion of soil, our present agriculture production is high—so high that many persons, including the Secretary of Agriculture, term it a "crushing abundance."

Therefore, some people believe this is not a popular time to talk about practices that will increase rather than decrease our present farm production.

I am not one of those people.

I believe our present so-called agricultural abundance is a temporary economic condition.

By 1975 the population of this country will have increased to approximately 193 million people.

For this reason alone we will then consume 41 percent more food than we did in 1950, a record agricultural year.

To be specific: By 1975 according to the report in 1952 of the President's Materials Policy Commission, we will consume 41 percent more corn, 42 percent more beef, 23 percent more wheat, and a total of 25 percent of such nonfood agricultural products as wool and cotton.

As can readily be seen, our present so-called crushing abundance will not meet those increased needs of the future.

We do have the potential of a substantial increase in agricultural production during the next 20 years. It is estimated that through irrigation, reclamation, and other conservation practices, we may be able to add some 80 million or 90 million acres to our present agricultural land.

But as stated in the materials policy report:

"In years gone by, an increase in farm production normally meant an increase in acres planted. But new lands for the extension of farm frontiers no longer exist. Relatively few new acres remain for the plow * * *. The bulk of future farm production—for the next 25 years or the next 100—must come from land already under cultivation."

Present indications are that by 1975, through straining our production potential to the utmost, this country will nevertheless want to consume 3 percent more wheat than we can produce, 23 percent more fresh vegetables, 11 percent more eggs, 7 percent more wool, 27 percent more beef, and 30 percent more pork.

This is why I say that unless we adopt now a program of nationwide soil conservation, improved farming practices, and agricultural research we will be faced with the necessity of having to go abroad for more and more of our food supply.

In this connection, the material policy report, a great piece of work, predicts that by 1975 our agricultural imports will increase 46 percent, while our agricultural exports will decline by about 36 percent.

In my judgment, therefore, it is imperative we now begin to explore all ways to reclaim land, control erosion, develop better seeds and fertilizers, improve and encourage crop rotation practices; and also launch a long-range program of research on how to conserve and preserve the soil on which every one of us depends for physical livelihood.

During the last war, after our rubber supply was almost completely cut off, the scientists went to work and came up with synthetic rubber.

But the big difference in this analogy and our impending food shortage is the fact there is no substitute for food. No one wants energy pills as a substitute for steak.

In the long run, civilization, as we know it could be as seriously threatened by the possible future shortage of these resources as by the possibility of a hydrogen war.

In the fields, mines, mountains, and waters of the United States and its possessions lies much of the opportunity to preserve our national security as well as our future prosperity.

Therefore, let us now take stock of our present conservation programs, and adapt them to meet the needs of the future.

It was Daniel Webster who said:

"Let us never forget that the cultivation of the earth is the most important labor of man. When tillage begins, other arts follow. The farmers, therefore, are the founders of civilization."

From South Dakota to South Carolina— An Invitation and a Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on May 5, I had the opportunity to address for the second time the State convention of the South Carolina State Bankers Association. The meeting was held in Greenville, S. C.

My central theme was that it is fully as important that American businessmen understand the mechanics of politics and

the science of political engineering as it is that they understand their machines of business and production or the science of economics.

My address was transcribed from the radio tape provided by the radio station broadcasting my off-the-cuff address to the convention, and I ask that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Thank you, very much, indeed, Mr. Chairman, for that altogether too generous introduction.

Distinguished officers of the South Carolina State Bankers Association, ladies and gentlemen of the convention, it really is worth the long trip from Washington to Greenville just alone to hear such a wonderful introduction as was presented to you by the distinguished chairman, a fellow politician of parts who accorded me all of the customary courtesies which extend between the members of our profession. However, I must make one slight correction in what we had to say because I recognize that it is dangerous enough for a Yankee Republican from South Dakota to come down into the sacred portals of South Carolina without having added to the uniqueness of the situation, a designation of having come from North Dakota. I come from far enough north as it is, and as long as there is an affinity between us which we have as South Dakotans and South Carolinians, I feel like I can speak with greater candor than if I came from that altogether strange land known as North Dakota.

They sometimes do confuse us, frequently confuse us, and I can understand why, but I like to point out the fact that there is at least one great distinction between North Dakota and South Dakota. It was brought out by the Associated Press statistics a couple of years ago which pointed out that the two States which have the greatest record of longevity from the standpoint of the people living within the boundaries of those States were North Dakota and South Dakota. For some strange reason, the climate or water or weather or something, the people there have a little slower rate of mortality than they have in any of the other 46 sister States. For some time it was a matter of chagrin to us, however, to realize that the people of North Dakota were a little bit better in their statistical averages than the people of South Dakota. Some way or another they cling to life a little more tenaciously, their mortality statistics were a little bit more optimistic than South Dakota. We thought, pondered, and worried about that for several months and tried to figure out what we could do to improve the living conditions of our State, and finally came to the inevitable conclusion that the reason why our good neighbors to the north hung on to life a little bit more persistently, were a little more reluctant to pass on, was because they cherished in their hearts the hope that before they died, they might live long enough to move down into South Dakota and become citizens of our State, and for that reason we are content to be only second high from the standpoint of those statistics.

Seeing you all here this morning brings to my mind a great many happy memories of my previous visit before this great association when you were in convention assembled over at Charleston. It brings to my mind many of the happy continuations and resurrections of those friendships which I have had during the intervening years as I have seen some of you here in South Carolina and have met some of you in other areas and as some of you have dropped into my Washington office to visit me.

I cherish greatly the friendships I have made in my visits into the South, and I rate none higher than those made in talking to

this distinguished company of business people and their wives here from this great State of South Carolina. It is indeed a privilege to be back. I have tried to figure out since I received the invitation from Mr. Alexander just why I was invited back. You know there are two kinds of speakers that come back for a second time before the same audience; there is the kind they invite to come back, and there is the kind they dare to come back, and I imagine, perhaps, that I come under the second category, because I recall that I spoke to you with complete candor when I was here before, as I intend to do this morning, because in these busy lives which all of us lead, there isn't much use of our just sitting around listening to pleasant mouthings of unimportant things.

It is interesting, when, on occasion, people with different points of view can get together, however, and discuss the things which they have in common and discuss the things as well on which they differ, and to try and find out how we can harness together each other's ideals and energies and abilities and talents in the public interest. That shall be the purport of my message here this morning.

I suspect that during the past quarter of a century of world history there have been more important changes made than in any other like period of human history, and, in my opinion, none of these changes insofar as they affect the American scene are concerned, none of the changes on the American scene is more important than this simple but incontrovertible fact, and that is that 25 years ago, economics—the profession in which you gentlemen have specialized—25 years ago economics was the controlling factor of our political life, and today politics has become the controlling factor in our economic life. It seems to me that that tremendous change very well typifies many of the problems which confront us, and pretty well challenges our ability whether we are economists, businessmen, or politicians to try and find a way to correct any difficulties which may have eventuated from that strange reversal of the coin.

In the early 1930's and in previous eras of American history, the economic tone of the Nation in large part determined the voting behavior of our citizens, and decided the fate of our various national administrations. We had slogans about the full dinner pail; campaign platforms, and campaign promises, and campaign pronouncements were made dealing with the unemployment statistics, dealing with the earning power of citizens, dealing primarily with the economic situation.

Today, I think, few if any among us, will deny the fact that the Government has grown so strong and Federal spending has become so important that the political bias of our national administrations determine the economic tone of our Nation and the financial status of millions of Americans whether they be workers or farmers or businessmen. Not all change in my opinion is progress, and, in my opinion, we have gone too far in the direction of gearing our prosperity curves and our individual financial success to the political philosophies which dominate the White House and the Congress. To return to an era in which the operation of economic principles and policies once again have a dominant part in determining our national destiny, however, is going to require a substantial shrinkage in the power, in the spending, and in the regulations of the Federal Government.

America today is enjoying unprecedented prosperity. We hear of that as we study every financial report of virtually every successful corporation in the country. Optimism for the future prevails on every side. These rose-tinted conditions have developed from the fact that we now have a national administration which commands public confidence and a bipartisan Congress which re-

spects private ownership and individual freedom. However, in any era, when the stock market stampedes up or down depending upon the readings of an electric cardiograph and when a public address by a member of the President's Cabinet can stimulate or retard vast industrial expenditures, there can be no denial of the fact that we are living in an era where political behavior has become the throttle which determines the speed or the success of economic expansion.

This being true, and I believe it to be true, businessmen, including bankers, including, may I say, especially bankers because so much of the rest of the economic community rightfully depends on bankers for counsel and advice, businessmen then, especially bankers, must reexamine their political prejudices and preferences and performances. I think the same is true in labor whose success is tied in so closely with the success of business but I am speaking here primarily to businessmen who, in my opinion, must become as well versed as to what is good for them politically as they are trained in what is good for their institutions economically.

To do less than that is to turn over the ultimate success of their enterprises to power-seeking professional politicians who consider politics solely as a device for achieving office and who use public power as a mucilaginous device for holding them in their positions of prestige and importance as long as possible. Those tactics have destroyed the economic strength and the political authority of many of our western democracies who less than 20 years ago were comparatively strong and stable. Those tactics, in my opinion, can devitalize America as well, and unless we pay as much attention to the political machines as we do the machines of commerce that we use in our offices and in our factories, it can very easily happen in this great country that we call America.

Increasingly the strong arm of Government is moving into your shops, into your offices, into your every economic determination, and that my good friends, brings me to the theme which I desire to talk about. With that historic backdrop I think that I should discuss with you the machinery and the mechanics of politics as I have come to understand them after some 20 years devoted to a study and analysis of them from the inside following, as the chairman has said, 10 years of study of them from the outside when I was engaged in teaching college youngsters about the basic tenants of America. Because of that, I appreciate this invitation even more to come down into the Deep South to think out loud with you for a while about some of these conclusions or conjectures which I have because I know that here I have always received respectful and responsible attention to the analysis.

AS DIXIE GOES, SO GOES THE WORLD

I come here not necessarily with any desire whatever to seek approval or acceptance of the suggestions that I make, but I always have the right to hope, and sometimes my hope is encouraged by some of the performances of recent history. I come here, however, primarily to discuss with you as honestly and as frankly and as faithfully as I can what I think is happening to America and what I think primarily can be changed in America only by the behavior politically of the people of the South.

I think of that when I get criticized by the people of my section of the country, when I turn down invitations as I had to do for today to talk about some pleasant subject before a noncontroversial audience, such as addressing a Republican convention about republicanism or talking to a woman's club about foreign policy or to a veteran's organization about patriotism or to farmers about farming in order to come down into this perilous atmosphere to discuss with you subjects which, in my opinion, are so important to be discussed here and before you.

But I have a prevailing feeling which has continued to evolve to greater and greater clarity and greater and greater emphasis, in my opinion. I have a prevailing conviction that what happens in Dixie in the next 10 years is going to determine definitely what happens to America in the next 100. And this I also believe—that what happens in America in the next few years is going to pretty clearly determine what happens around the globe, because so many little people in smaller countries or less-developed areas are watching this great clash of the ideologies hoping that our system will prevail, but fearful that it won't, so I think that our capacity to make America work well is going to go a long way to determine what happens in other countries of this great world of ours.

I, therefore, welcome this opportunity to talk to important people in the most important area of the world, because what you do or fail to do, I believe, is going to determine the fate of humanity in the century just ahead. No other great area of the country or of the world by its own free choice has such an opportunity and with it, in my opinion, such a tremendous responsibility.

THE CURSE OF MODERN GOVERNMENT

I think the curse of modern government around the world is the fact that steadily and continuously and perniciouly it has been constantly expanding the power of its functionaries in the capital cities of each country of the world. Without exception, in the countries of importance the power of people in political jobs like mine and in the executive department, and in the judiciary, and in the central cities of the land has been expanding steadily over the functions of people in private jobs like yours. It has brought disaster and war and unhappiness to large segments of the world. It has brought to Britain almost a collapse of its economic solvency. We in the United States have resisted this global trend more successfully than others, but few among us will argue that we have resisted it completely or enough.

We have gone downward on the same train, down the same hill; our brakes have held us back a little, but not enough to protect our economic and political safety. I believe, and I may have said this when I was here before, that future historians writing about the America of the thirties and the forties and the fifties, and future histories written about the pages of America which are yet unknown, looking for a point of departure, looking for a place in which to put a thumbtack marking the time and the date and the hour and the place where America changed from a complete and faithful following of certain economic, social, and political concepts to something strangely and dangerously different, are going to find that place and mark that hour as the occasion of the great national convention of the strong and great Democratic Party, to which you belong, which was held in convention assembled in the year 1936, in the city of Philadelphia.

I think they will mark that development in 1936 as they study what has been happening in America to such universally accepted American institutions and practices, for example, as private ownership, as our reward of merit system, as the great American concept of giving individual initiative unlimited opportunity to expand, or the great American and uniquely American concept of States rights and the feeling that in this Commonwealth of States which makes up the Republic known as the United States of America, States have functions and States have privileges and States have rights, along with maintaining a meaningful significant effective two-party system with adequate political machinery to make it operate.

As they inquire as to why America, blessed with all of those things preceding the thirties, has suddenly begun a concentrated attack upon them all trying to devitalize and

trying to stultify them, trying at times to destroy them, they will also have to analyze what developments followed your actions in that convention. Why did it happen to us? No other foreign country has adopted a formula of economic or political behavior even remotely approximating the successes we had achieved. We had lived well and had gone forward with great rapidity regardless of whether your party or mine was in power in the White House. Under Republicans and Democrats alike in Congress or in the White House, America had gone ahead. We had become the envy of the world, the only country compelled to erect immigration barriers to be safe from being flooded out by all the rest of humanity that wanted to locate here so that they could enjoy private ownership, to locate here so they could enjoy the reward of merit system, to locate here so that they could give their individual initiative a chance to expand, to locate here where they could uniquely become a citizen of a state which had some rights and a governor and a supreme court and some mores and some customs and some laws of its own. From every other land they wanted to locate here because we had a two-party system. We had a political machine and political mechanics which made every man a king, gave every individual a right to help determine his own destiny. Why are we changing? Why have we changed? When did it happen and where?

A TURNING POINT IN AMERICAN POLITICAL BEHAVIOR

Historians will have to answer that. I think as I said that they are going to pick the place that I have mentioned, and the Democratic convention of 1936 as the hour, and the change of your convention rules as the cause—when the South was compelled to abandon your two-thirds rule reluctantly it was with far less a degree of reluctance, I am sure, than you would have shown had you known as clearly then what was going to happen as we all know now. In all of this when the South was compelled to abandon their two-thirds rule in Democratic conventions, and at the same time retain the unit rule which was a siamese twin companion of the two-thirds rule, we set in operation political machinery which has influenced completely our ensuing developments. The spirit of America has not changed; our basic goals have not changed; our objectives have not changed; but something has happened to the politics and the machinery of self-government in this beloved Republic of ours.

This whole thing we call politics—or the mechanics of self-government. Thus, it is political engineering and the machinery of politics which has changed your lives and mine, and which has altered tremendously all predictions for our future. By projecting forward the trends of the past 20 years we can rather accurately predict what lies ahead for all of us unless some sharp and permanent political changes are made by you good folks of the old South. We can now envision how political developments determine all human behavior and what you do or fail to do down here different from what has been your prevailing political behavior will call the tune for all Americans.

It isn't only upon your traditional Democratic Party that the break with the past which took place at the Democratic National Convention of 1936 had a propertic and determining impact. Actually that change in your convention rules had indirectly but definitely almost as important and lasting an effect upon our Republican Party. In a great 2-party country like ours, the behavior and bias of one of our parties always tends to influence the behavior and bias of the other. Anything which succeeds steadily for the one is certain to be emulated by the other. Anything that brings defeat to the one is likewise avoided by the other. Thus,

our two parties learn from each other just as they tend to imitate and approximate each other at regular intervals.

When for a long time—a sorrowful and mighty expensive long time, I might say—campaign and convention tactics which were designed to appeal to mass voters in big blocs (especially in our metropolitan cities of the North) brought you stupendous and steady majorities to the Democratic or the New Deal Party, it was understandable and inevitable that my Republican Party started emulating some of those tactics. We started directing our appeals to those same bloc voters. Since, in the main, the interests and ideals of the South do not coincide with those of the CIO-PAC, or those of Americans for Democratic Action, or those of the "banana-bunch" type of voters who group themselves in ethnic, vocational, left-wing, or other pressure groups, it appeared for a time that the fine folks of the old South were to be left out of the picture altogether when it came to determining the political policies of either major party. You were on the way to becoming the world's largest group of enfranchised citizens whose voices were ignored in the making of party policy and in the selection of party candidates and whose votes were considered so safely in the bag that neither party paid you any heed.

Then came 1948, when four courageous States of Dixie signaled to the rest of the country that they had had enough. No longer were they willing to be tied tight in the back seat of a political automobile which they were never permitted to steer.

And then came 1952. I sometimes feel that the Divine Architect of the Universe, realizing that America is His last chance to make decency prevail, to make freedom function, and to give law-obeying citizens a civilization which they themselves can regulate and control decides to step in to help us all set America right. Recognizing, for example, that if peace and self-government collapse here, they will have failed all over, perhaps He moves in just 15 minutes before it is altogether too late in order to give Americans and America another chance.

In all events, came 1952, and an unanticipated, and unexpected development took place. Americans, pretty much without any party designation whatsoever, turned to a great American leader in a military sense who himself had no political designations whatsoever, and both parties sought to secure Dwight Eisenhower as their candidate for President. My party happened to succeed. I don't suppose he would have been any different individual had your party succeeded. In all events, pretty much by acclamation, joined in, I am proud to say, by five great southern Democratic States and encouraged by the rest of them, the country turned to someone outside of political life, and said, "Mr. Eisenhower, you take over and be President of the country."

AMERICA NOW HAS A SECOND CHANCE— PROVIDED DIXIE LEADS THE WAY

That has given us a breathing spell; that has given us a chance for a second look. It has not, nor could it be expected to have, solved completely any of the problems and challenges that we are confronted with. It has not altered what, in my opinion, is positively going to eventuate as a result of what happened in that Democratic convention, or even what happened to my party as a result of that convention; it has not altered what is going to lie ahead once the Eisenhower era is over. I very frankly was one of those who thought for a long time after the President's unfortunate heart attack that he would not be able to become a candidate for office. I worried about that, because this I believe: Once Ike is no longer a candidate, America is going to face a showdown decision on basic principles the verdict of which is going to dominate the lives of all of us

for the rest of our existence. I expected that to come in 1956.

I consequently worried about that 1956 decision because I knew America wasn't ready from the standpoint of political engineering to make that verdict honestly and effectively and on basic principles devoid of partisan prejudices. We are not yet ready to avoid old political affinities or to eliminate a lot of cloudy fuzziness in our elective machinery which makes it pretty well impossible today for right-thinking people in America to unite on a basic issue, regardless of where they happen to live geographically or how they happen to be registered politically. Unless we can develop the necessary political machinery to do that, I am going to tell you before this address is over who is going to write the ticket for Uncle Sam, and you aren't going to like the ticket, and neither am I. You aren't going to have anything to do about writing the ticket, and neither am I, unless down here you people rise up to one of the greatest challenges our civilization ever had and utilize the essential techniques of sound political engineering to write the right kind of ticket for the country and the world.

I know you are not ready for that in 1956, and that's one reason, I suspect, if I were to be completely frank, that is the greatest reason, I am so glad that Ike's heart has restored itself to the point where he can run again and thus give America until 1960 to develop the necessary political changes to preserve our cherished freedoms.

Some of you will like what I am going to say now, and some of you will dislike it, but I tell it to you as an observation I believe to be a fact: I think that if that heart holds up, as I believe it will, our present President is going to be reelected for a second term. I think our breathing spell, which looked like it was going to be cut short by 4 years, which wouldn't have given us much time for political engineering, is going to get a second breath, and that we will now have until 1960 to get ready for the showdown issues.

I think this breathing spell, this era of moderation, this middle-of-the-road consolidation of our position, this resistance to further movements in the direction of socialism, will carry on under Eisenhower's leadership until 1960. If it does, the question is, "Will we be ready then to answer the five prodigious questions you and I are going to have to answer then and could conceivably be called upon to answer even as soon as next November?"

FIVE BASIC ISSUES FACING US NOW—OR IN 1960

The first question is, "How big would you like to have the Federal Government become?" We have two opinions in this country. I don't discredit or disparage the patriotism of those who hold as many do that the Federal Government should grow on continuously. That 20 years from now State governors should not have any importance whatsoever except to perform ceremonial functions like a British king. State legislatures even less. People are entitled to that opinion. The British have had a unitary system of government without a breakdown into states' rights, and states' capitals, and states' functions for a long while. The British are a remarkable people. I have visited there many times. I respect their indefatigability and their courage and what they are able to do in their Island Kingdom. So few of them have affected the lives of so many. But that is something you have got to decide—how big do you want our Federal Government to grow? I'll make a guess with you. I know the people of South Dakota better than I know the people of South Carolina, but I can tell you this, that the people of South Dakota say, "Our Federal Government has already gotten too big, we want it smaller." I think you also believe that; I don't know; but if you believe that, I submit to you that we don't

have the political machinery today with which you can effectively and easily join up with South Dakotans who believe like you. We've got to cut down the size and the interference and the power of the Federal Government. But still we lack effective political machinery for deciding the question in conformity with our convictions. If we decide that we want the Government bigger than it is, that's a permanent decision because once you socialize an industry, it can be power or it could be banking, and it's likely to be banking's big sister, the insurance industry before it actually is banking—once you nationalize a big industry, it is very difficult to denationalize it, to get it back to private owners. So remember we are playing for keeps. We are making a verdict for which there is not going to be a mistrial and a second chance, and in my opinion we are not ready to make that verdict properly with our existing political allotments. That is why I prayerfully give thanks for Eisenhower, who is going to give us time, in my opinion, to get ready for this big important decision in 1960.

Second question: "How much should the Federal Government cost?" There are good people in this country, patriotic people, who say they can settle this question: "Spend as much as you can. We only owe the money to ourselves. Why worry about balancing the budgets? Spend for everything, spend everywhere, spend all the time, you can always get it from the people in taxes." I don't question their patriotism. I question their economics. I deplore their judgment. I know they are preaching something which is anathema to the economic concepts which I studied in college; repugnant to the economic concepts which my people believe. I know my people don't like these spending sprees out in South Dakota. They think we are spending too much now. I think so too. I think you think so too, but if you do, there isn't any generally acceptable political machinery in this greatest country in the world today which will easily and effectively permit the people in South Carolina and the people in South Dakota in a national election to join forces to strike a blow for economy or to team up in voting for a party or a President pledged to perform economically and who will be faithful to that pledge.

Third big decision: "How much should the Government own and operate?" I don't know what you believe. I know there is a big segment of the South that believes that the power business should be turned over to the Federal Government. Maybe so. I certainly believe the Federal Government should own some things. Most of us surely agree it should run the Army, and the Air Force, and our post offices, but I think and I believe you think, and I know the people of South Dakota think that the Federal Government should cease expanding out as a giant competitor to private enterprises all over. I believe that you and I believe and I know the people of South Dakota too, believe the Federal Government shouldn't get into the automobile business, or the insurance business, or the banking business, that we shouldn't have socialized medicine, that we shouldn't have Government radio, we shouldn't have Government railroads, we shouldn't have Government newspapers. Now there are good Americans who believe otherwise. Some of them are in Congress now. We are going to have to decide this basic issue pretty soon. I thought, perhaps, we were going to have to decide that in 1956. With Ike a candidate, we'll have additional time, but in 1960 when we go back to bidding for the bunches of votes where they are and have to promise the bloc voters the things they want, it will be an issue. In fact, it could unhappily become a fact without ever having become an issue in the campaign, because if both parties start promising what your one party

was promising in the forties, these things can become an actuality without your ever having a chance to vote upon them in the good American way.

How much should the Government own and operate?

I introduced a year ago in the Senate of the United States an amendment which was a simple amendment, I thought. I thought it would go through almost unanimously. I never had been as discouraged in 18 years in Washington as the day my amendment was defeated on a roll call vote. The President of the United States had sent up a request to Congress. It was a simple request. He said that we have discovered that there are over 2,500 different private enterprises in which the Federal Government is unnecessarily engaged. That your Government and mine was operating 50 coffee-roasting plants, a bunch of pop-bottling works, 2 or 3 barbed wire factories, some paint factories, some clothing factories, some furniture factories, all under the guise of supplying things for the armed services or of making them more economical for our give-away programs of foreign aid, whatever they were. I was aghast when I saw the President's report. He asked for permission to sell them back to you, the private citizens of America. I was a member of the Appropriations Committee so I introduced an amendment to the Appropriation's Act implementing the President's request. Let's give the President the power to divest himself, and the Federal Government of all the socialistic enterprises not essential to our national defense or our national economy, I stated in support of my amendment. In a roll call vote, the United States Senate in the year of our Lord 1955 defeated that amendment. Why did they defeat it?

Some good, sturdy, strong private enterprise Senators voted "No" because it happened that one or more of those particular industries were located in their communities or in their States and the realities of practical politics induced them to vote that way. I am happy to say that we finally got an amended version of my proposal through which said that unless the Appropriations Committee itself resisted by resolution any divestments of economic enterprises by the President, he could go forward with the program. So through that hurdle and through that screen he has been able to get rid of some 500 of the 2,500. Two thousand of them still are run by you and me as collective entrepreneurs under a system as completely socialistic as anything the "B and K boys" of modern Russia could possibly conceive, because there isn't anything more totalitarian than the complete government ownership of an industry, whether you do it under the stars and stripes or whether you do it under the hammer and the sickle. If the politicians run it, they run it and it is in competition with the rest of the economy if competition is at all permitted. Anyhow a decision on how much further America should move toward national socialism is one which we shall have to make in 1960.

The fourth decision: "How much authority should government exercise as a device for influencing our individual lives? How much authority do you want to give to us in Washington, to determine how you live, what you can and cannot do, into what businesses you can or cannot go, what hours your laborers can work and what you might pay them, what you can raise on your farms and plantations and what you cannot raise, the social mores of your community, who can and cannot attend church with you or go to school with you or work with you—these are the questions to be decided by voters in national elections—I don't know.

Some very fine friends of mine in Congress believe that people like you and people

like me cannot be trusted to be ethical or decent or chivalrous or Christian or honest in our behavior, so that you have to give to politicians down in Washington custody over the collective goodness of the country and let them project it out from their angelic countenances by the political power of unimpeded centralized government. I do not believe that. I don't denounce them for their beliefs. I simply say that I, myself, dissent from their conclusions. I think the people who elect the politicians are certainly as good as the politicians they elect, and that the collective judgment of our people is always better than the individual judgment of anybody they elect. Consequently, if we retain for ourselves some of the rights of decision, we vest those determinations in a better spot than if we turn them all over to politicians and the Federal Government.

This is an issue to be decided, if not in 1956, most certainly in 1960. You know what is going to happen in 1960 as well as I. You don't have to have spent 30 years studying political behavior of the great parties of this country to know that in 1960 the great bid is going to be to the groups of voters in the big towns who want to do certain things in America, and who say if you agree to do them, our millions of people will vote your way. So if one party promises it, as your Democratic or New Deal Party is most likely to promise it on the basis of the historic record, the other party is going to be compelled to promise it or be defeated.

Either eventually would be almost equally calamitous insofar as resisting the expansion of political and economic power in Washington is concerned. Our political machinery isn't in order today so that those who resist these trends in the South can join your forces to those in the North resisting them. Divided as we are by antiquated and meaningless political labels and legends, we cannot win. This is another reason I am happy that things are happening as they are in 1956. We need at least until 1960 to develop some new political machinery.

The fifth big decision that we have got to make: "How far should the Government go to take us into the functions of the welfare state?" We all recognize our joint responsibility to people who are injured, disabled, too old, improvident, blind, diseased. How far do we want to go? How far is it necessary to turn over to Federal politicians in the Capital City the operation of our hospitals and our health-insurance programs; our clinics and our local relief activities? How far must the old cash and charity that used to permeate the heart of most Americans be collectivized in the office of a member of the Cabinet down in Washington? We are not going to go back. We are not going to abandon what has been started. I said earlier that it is difficult to desocialize. It's mighty hard to take away from somebody something he has been getting. Each Congress, though, each national convention, each presidential candidate is beleaguered by those who constantly say "We want more." We are going to have to decide where we draw the line, or do we draw the line; do we follow the example of Great Britain? I like it like they put it down on paper that hot sticky summer down in Philadelphia's Independence Hall so long ago when our wise, far-sighted constitutional forefathers knew what was likely to happen if they brought forward on this continent a new Nation dedicated to the proposition that the men and women living there could rule themselves, so they wrote it in the preamble.

At Philadelphia they said the function of this new Government is going to be in part to provide the national defense. To be free, we must be secure. To be secure, we must have a common national defense. The function of the Federal Government is to provide it. To tax the people for the arms that they need, to conscript the soldiers if you need

them for a war, to win a war if we get in, to protect ourselves, to maintain peace if we can do it. We must be strong. The function of the Federal Government is to provide that defense. Our constitutional forefathers made that clear.

People were thinking about general welfare in those days also. The next clause in the preamble of our Constitution is an interesting one. Interesting because of the language that they used. They talked about general welfare. They had said that the purpose of the Federal Government is to provide the national defense. What about the general welfare? Note well the word that they used. To provide the national defense and to promote—and to promote—the general welfare. What a difference. That's the difference, isn't it, between the U. S. S. R. and the U. S. A.? It's the difference between Hitler's Germany and us. It's the difference between the welfare state and welfare assistance in this country. It could be the difference between two political parties. It could be an issue that we are going to decide in 1956 or 1960. Do you want to keep it that way? Does that make sense? Did it work out all right to have a great big Republic like this which provided the national defense and promoted the general welfare, made jobs available, made it easier for people to secure general welfare, did what we could to promote it without adopting a paternalistic Government so that everybody was fastened to the Federal pact? We are going to make that decision in this country not later than 1960. In my opinion, we are not ready to do it today because of our political machinery. And, in my opinion also, our American experiment not only worked out all right but it has provided living standards for all elements which are the goal and envy of the entire world.

I have said all this on an assumption that may be false or wrong or right and proper; namely, that South Carolinians, along with South Dakotans, will be on the side of limited powers of Government on these five major decisions. If I'm wrong, you have nothing to worry about, except that you have had to listen to a speech of no particular interest to you; but if I'm right, and you want what we want, you have some mighty serious thinking to do on a plane so much higher than partisan politics that it isn't even in the same range of atmospherical statistics. We have got some political engineering to do if you agree with my assumption. Let me suggest five things that might be done now, or that we can start to do now, to save us from the great big controlling bloc of votes and the socialistic trends that I am going to mention soon.

FIVE SUGGESTED REMEDIES

In the first place, we might develop the kind of political realignment that I was talking about when I spoke to you in Charleston some years ago. Getting the right thinking people of the country—let's not say that—let's be completely fair—getting the people who think alike in this country and who think conservatively and in terms of a modification and limitation of the powers of the Central Government; getting them into some kind of political party or political apparatus or political association or political instrumentalities so that they can vote alike for the same candidate on the same ticket regardless of what the party label is or where they live geographically.

We have made some headway in that direction. We haven't made it very fast. That's why I shuddered when I thought we were going to make these five great lasting determinations for the rest of my life in 1956, and why I hoped we could defer them for another 4 years to get ready to write the verdict. Then I'm content to live by it if most of my fellow Americans under a voting system which gives them a fair chance to vote in a national referendum desire the

towering size of the omnipotent state, I'm willing to accept it. I suppose I will be a candidate again from the State of South Dakota, although I'm not going to be happy with all of that power because I know that it isn't going to be good for you. I think that under that kind of system I could talk up a speech that would be persuasive enough to be elected for the rest of my natural life out in South Dakota. I would have authority and I would have power and where I couldn't talk them into voting my way, I could seduce them to come over with a dam, or a bounty, or a pension, or a new post office or something else that I could bring by nature of loot from the Federal Government which by that time would be dominating all their lives. But I wouldn't like it. I would rather take a chance on trying to discuss with them the basic principles in which we jointly believe and win or lose on that basis.

I believe firmly in free choice by free voters. To get such free choice, however, and for freemen to reach sound political decisions, it is essential that we realine our partisan groupings in America. Southern Democrats and rural Republicans in this country have much in common. Their points of agreement on basic economic and political issues far outstrip their areas of disagreement. But we need to do some political engineering so we can work and vote together. So long as we cancel out each other's votes for President, we help the trend toward the total American state and defeat our ideals and our own best interests.

A second device we tried, and may I say here that we tried this with the support of your two good South Carolina Senators in this session of Congress: OLIN JOHNSTON, whom I have known for a long time and with whom I have served on the Senate Committee on Agriculture, and Strom Thurmond, that new gladiator from down South that you sent up there, who has cut probably the widest swath in the United States Senate ever cut by so young a Senator in so short a time. We proposed to do some political engineering, to get ready for 1960. We offered a constitutional amendment that wouldn't do any good under any circumstances for 1956, but would take off from the neck of the Democratic Party of America and the Republican Party of America, the big foot of the big cities of America who now dominate in the main the thinking, the activities, and the trends of both political parties.

We proposed by our amendment to break up the bloc-system of electoral voting. We proposed to give both those who vote for the winning candidate and those voting against the winning candidate a chance to have their votes counted at the electoral college level. This proposed constitutional amendment would have driven a death nail into the domineering controls of the city machines and some of their associated pressure groups. It takes a two-thirds vote to get it through the Senate. We debated it for a week. We received a majority vote but we lacked six votes from getting the essential two-thirds majority required to pass a constitutional amendment, so it's back in the Senate Committee on the Judiciary again. It's called the Mundt-Daniel-Thurmond amendment. I'm presently corresponding with Strom Thurmond, who's down in South Carolina enjoying a short vacation before resuming his activities in Washington, and we are soon going to come up with a new version of this amendment which we hope the Senate will approve early next year.

I think it is tremendously important, for example, that we break up a system which means, as I put it during a Senate debate, that one sodden drunk can fall off of a park bench in Battery Park of New York City, and hitting the ground wake up and stagger and stumble into a voting booth on election day, not knowing where he is, and, in the heat of

the election booth to keep from falling on his face in his drunken stupor, reach for an election lever as a support and accidentally pull the election lever down, thereby determining the entire outcome of a national Presidential election. Do you all fully realize this can actually happen? That one vote cast by Mr. Stumble Bum in New York City can put in action 45 electoral votes which mean more than all of the votes cast by intelligent people voting unanimously in 12 or 13 separate States of the United States. Break up that system of unit voting in the electoral college so that no one group, no one city, no one State, and no one collection of 12 metropolitan cities in this country can run the rest of us, and you are moving in the direction of modernizing and improving our political machinery. We would then begin giving like-minded people a chance to vote alike regardless of where they live politically or where they are registered geographically. We would be taking our elections out of the hands of pressure groups and big-city political machines and putting them back in the hands of the people where they belong.

The third available remedy is revising your State election laws. We can do something in all of our States to make it easier for people to cross party lines and make it easier for a second party to get into operation, to make it easier for people who happen to be registered with one party and want to vote for another party for a certain cause to do so. That's a local responsibility which, in my opinion, can and should be locally met and which was locally met courageously under the leadership of Governor Allan Shivers over in Texas prior to the last election. I hope it can be met with equal success in a great many other States of the Union.

Of course, other States may follow the example of South Carolina in the last election under the leadership of an old friend of mine and a great American, who, except for the political mechanics of our country during his prime might well have been a candidate and President of the United States. I'm talking about Jimmy Byrnes of South Carolina. Jimmy Byrnes in 1952 demonstrated a courageous and patriotic leadership which other States, I hope, and other Governors will follow. His example in the last election, when, ignoring parties and concentrating on principles and confidence in personalities, he supported a candidate not of his own political party for the highest office in the land, deserves emulation by other courageous Democrats who are neither Fair Dealers or New Dealers. It is the medicine in the bottle that counts—not the label on the outside of the container. Governor Byrnes came pretty close to running up the score for South Carolina in support of Dwight D. Eisenhower. He came close enough to help write some new American history. He came close enough to cause even the city machines to wonder if somebody might be trying to get out of the bag in which they have been held so long and on which the party bosses in the big towns thought they had tied the knot.

Senator HARRY BYRD, a great American in anybody's book, did the same thing in Virginia. Virginia voted for the man HARRY BYRD supported. Allen Shivers and PRICE DANIEL did the same thing in Texas. Texas voted for the man that they supported. I simply point out that there are times when principles prevail, when the perils of following the line of least resistance are so great, that men have courage like Jimmy Byrnes, whose golden wedding anniversary I was happy to note this week has been observed by Mrs. Byrnes and Jimmy. Men take leadership to get results. They are history-makers. As long as southern political traditions continue, that is one way to break out of the trap.

I have discussed this for many years in every State of the South as your chairman said, and I did it because of no partisan motive. I do it only because there isn't any

other place that America can be saved from the consequences of the new controls which have been operating in this country as a result of what we all lost in the Democratic National Convention of 1936, and I use the word "we" advisedly. In the evolution and the development of the competent forces which now control the country, there is no way to escape those consequences except by some of the devices that I am mentioning. Changing the two-thirds rule in 1956 is a fourth method by which conservatives at the Democratic Convention could do the job. I think it may be hard to do but it could be done. Even breaking up the unit rule, which was a part of the two-thirds rule would help tremendously. It would once again have its same impact on my party as it has on yours, because parties emulate each other.

A FLORIDA LEGISLATOR SPEAKS OUT

It would move political controls in both our parties back to the hands of the people and out of the hands of political bosses and pressure groups. I was talking on this subject 2 months ago in Florida, and at a friend's home afterward, a man came up to me by the name of O'Neill Rogells, and may I say now that I use his name with his permission, came up to see me and introduced himself and said: "I have been a member of the legislature down in Tallahassee; I'm a Democrat. No northerner has ever come down and talked to us like this before. I'm more interested in America than I am in my political party or my political career." Mr. Rogells further said: "If you could promise me, Senator MUNDT, that your party at the next convention would write a strong States right platform, as strong as you did in your last convention in 1952, and nominate candidates who will support it and believe in it (Eisenhower will do if he is available), if you can promise me that you will get that kind of platform and perform on it in Congress, I'll register Republican in Florida despite I'm a member of the legislature of the Democratic Party in Florida."

I said, "Mr. Rogells, that is a very interesting suggestion, and a very encouraging one, because what does a political party mean in a war? Did you ever hear anybody come back from the war in Korea, and that was a war, did you ever hear anybody say 'We lost a skirmish down there because I told the boys in the troops that half of them belonged to the other political party and I wouldn't work with them'? You never heard that, did you? You forget all about political registrations when you get into the uniform of Uncle Sam. When you have a common cause, who cares if your Commanding Officer is a Republican or a Democrat or a North Dakota progressive or an Independent? You are concerned only about result."

So I said, "Mr. Rogells, your suggestion is challenging and interesting. As the issues confront us now, we are having a tough fight to hold our Party to an unfailing support of State's rights. I happen to belong to what we call the 'Thin White Line' of the Republican Party that's trying to keep our State's rights position alive; that talks about it openly and votes for it consistently; and tries to pursue it; and encourages the White House and the executive agencies and even the courts when we can, to remember and to sustain our State's rights. But we lose almost as many battles as we win. We are going to have a hard time at our convention. Those opposing the rights of States have been fighting us consistently since 1932 and driving us further and further into a corner. We could lose our fight in 1956 or 1960. Why don't you join us now? We need your help."

Mr. Rogells said, "I can't be sure that you are going to win it. I want to be sure." I said, "Look, my friend," I noticed he had a service button in his lapel, "You remind me of a situation where in a battle on a mountain slope, your side of the battle is up on the ridge with a thin and faltering line that

is facing stupendous odds, and you send a runner back to a commanding officer who has a large platoon of troops about a half mile down the hill and tell him you need reinforcements quick or we'll lose the battle and the officer sends back the runner and says 'Keep on fighting boys and if you can get the enemy on the retreat, we'll come on up and join you with the cheers.' Mr. Rogells, we need you now, or we're apt to lose."

The conversation ended on that and then two weeks later I got a clipping from a newspaper down in Sarasota saying "Rogells Breaks With Demos." I read the article and Mr. Rogells tells how he is joining the Republican Party in Florida for the sole purpose of trying to be sure that they send to the convention Republican delegates who'll stand up and fight for a States rights platform in the Republican Party. He says I know we can't get it in the Democratic Party because we have tried it there and failed completely.

I wrote him a letter and told him I certainly appreciate that and that I was going to make a talk in South Carolina to the State Bankers' Association and I would like to mention his courageous action as another possible device if I may, but I wouldn't think of discussing our conversation or his name unless he gave me his permission. Here is his wire: "Senator MUNDT, appreciate your kind remarks. You have my permission to use statement in any way you see fit, O'Neill Rogells."

I mention this action as another way to solve our political problems. I'm not necessarily advocating; I don't think perhaps that it is the most effective way in a completely one party State like South Carolina. I simply mention it as another remedy. If 500 of the most prominent Democratic families in South Carolina, for instance, were to register Republican within any given month and publicize it widely you could go far toward rewriting the future pattern for America. There are ways that free men can escape from the trap you're in. The formula followed by Mr. Rogells is a fifth such possibility.

I have mentioned five possible remedies. Suppose we don't take any of them. May I make one final prediction, then before we close? Unless some way or another this great section of the country becomes unpredictable, unchained, unless you can take the lead, the five biggest blocs of votes in this country are going to continue to dominate your party and perhaps mine. I'm perfectly frank to say that they have already influenced mine to a considerable degree. And to the greater degree to which they influence yours and the greater degree to which that brings victory to your Democratic standard, I'm frank to confess, to that greater degree we are going to go in the direction of total centralization of authority in Washington. Unless some of these things that I have talked about are done, and they can be done only in Dixie, and only by southerners in Dixie, and only by Democrats in Dixie, because most of the best people of the South are Democrats, then I know unless you do something different, socialism will soon again become a realistic menace in America.

FIVE VOTE BLOCS WHO KNOW WHAT THEY WANT

The biggest voter bloc in this country today that influences more political behavior in Washington than any other bloc, I suppose, including the Republican and Democrat National Committees combined, is this new organization known as the CIO-AFL-PAC. Two great labor unions have merged and they have told the world "We are going to whip our enemies and elect our friends." They have told the candidates in both parties, "If you will move in the direction that we want you to move far enough, we will support you, or we'll support the one that yields to our demands the most, even though he is your opponent and of a different political party."

Add them up my good friends; there are tens of millions of them, these voters incorporated in the CIO-AFL merger. They are going to control a great many public decisions unless we find a political mechanism so those holding a different point of view can work together. I say that without criticism of the CIO-PAC. Why shouldn't they do that? They are Americans. They are loyal. They have a right to organize. They have their points of view, and while it happens they belong to a certain class and they unhappily seem to be trying to develop a class consciousness in this country, which in my opinion is unconscionable in America, still their patriotism is unquestioned and they have a right to function in the political system if they are smart enough to do it, and if those opposing their excesses are stupid enough not to react effectively, who can complain? If they should bring socialism to America under Mr. Reuther as President some day, that would be their right is it done by the ballot, and if we permit our political machinery to be controlled by their zealous leaders.

The second biggest bloc is your city machines led by politicians who play politics for pelt not for public service. These are bossed by men who discovered in the last quarter of a century that "There is gold in them thar Potomac hills" and they are no longer going to fool around merely with electing sheriffs and police judges in big cities like Chicago and New York. They have learned they can drive people to the polls by multitudes, many of whom can neither read nor write in the English language, who haven't studied American history, who don't know American traditions, and who come from countries which had paternalistic governments before they moved here. Yet, they can outvote all of the rest of us. You can forget about Dixie as you can forget about the Dakotas and Nebraska and Kansas, so long as you continue to give the bosses of the city political machines in the 12 major cities and the 8 big States of this country votes enough to bring about a determination in a national election because of our failure to change some of our political machinery, especially the method of unit voting in our electoral college. I don't complain about that. I simply point out that we should exceed them and excel them in their wisdom and in their determination. They have a right to do what they can to boss America. But we have a duty to make the reforms needed to prevent their successful domination.

The third big group, and I say this completely without any suggestion of criticism of the colored voters of this country, is the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. They have a right to their opinion. In my opinion they have a right to vote. They have a right to organize, and they have become a great organized voting bloc in this country seeking successes from their standpoint. There is nothing un-American about that, but it's a tremendous appeal to politicians on every side in every party to say, "If that many votes are involved, from the third biggest voting bloc in America, why not get them? Why not solicit them?" They have become more important through their association than the collective vote of all of Dixie, and more important than the collective vote of the States of the Missouri and Mississippi Valley, and we think that we are important people. We would like to get back into the Union, and we would like to find a way to join you in adopting basic fundamental principles which are not swayed by emotional suasion and are not based on prejudicial points of view. We want you in Dixie to get back into the Union, too, insofar as your voting importance is concerned.

The fourth biggest bloc of votes in this country is what they call the ethnic groups,

the hyphenated American organizations: People who come here and organize associations with the land of their ancestry and are attached to it. They read newspapers in the native language of their homeland, make frequent trips, write many letters back and forth, and maintain for many years greater attachments over there than over here. But, above everything else, they form voting blocs. This reminds me that a Democratic Congressman told me the other day in Chicago that all he needs to do to get elected is to see one Polish leader in Chicago and he's in. All of the Polish people, said he, in Chicago follow his suggestion. There is nothing wrong about that. It isn't illegal. I don't criticize it. I simply point out that we are living in a political era when blocs like that, which join at least in desiring more power for the central Government are going to control unless intelligent folks like you and me start living in the present and forget about the past and make at least as much of a study of political engineering as we have of mechanical and electrical and atomic engineering, in which fields we all have had to become educated.

The fifth largest pressure group is Americans for Democratic Action, a little association of self-protesting liberals who actually preach a doctrine carrying you back to feudalism when the king could do no wrong and the state was supreme. Americans for Democratic Action offer up their votes to the highest bidder. I'm happy to say that I belong to a political party which up to now has consistently refused to bid for the votes of that outfit and I hope that we Republicans continue to resist them even though we lose, because they are trying to push us as far toward socialism as is possible, as far as is favored by any sizable group in the United States of America today. They'll pack in a lot of people at their meeting a week from today in the city of Washington to write the ticket they are going to insist you Democrats adopt at your convention in Chicago this summer. I note a report in the papers of yesterday that they are inviting speakers including Elmer Davis, Ke-fauver, Stevenson, Walter Reuther of the CIO-AFL, Governor Williams of Michigan, Eleanor Roosevelt, Senator Lehman, Senator Humphrey, Senator Morse, and other like-minded and bewildered "liberals." I'm happy we Republicans have been excluded from the speakers' rostrum. I must point out that these people in the ADA are smart Americans and what they are doing is legal. I don't question their patriotism. They are just outsmarting the rest of the country. They point out that their main job in that convention in Washington next week is to further devitalize the influence of the South in the Democratic Party. That's why they are there.

I emphasize that you have a bigger bloc of votes in Dixie than any of the five great groups that I have mentioned provided you can develop a voting mechanism that will attach you some way or another to other right-thinking people in the North for specific purposes in specific campaigns. By doing that you can exercise the political influence which alone can save America.

I have nothing against any of these organizations: the CIO-PAC, the city machines, the organized colored voters, the ethnic voting blocs, or the ADA. I accept them all into our fraternity of Americans as good citizens, but I simply point out that, in my opinion, I wouldn't want any of those blocs, or all of them combined, to write the final political and economic ticket for America. I'd rather have it written by the people of the rural areas of this country, and by voters in our cities and on our farms who belong to no self-interested pressure groups. I'd rather have it written by the Republicans I know back home and the Democrats I know down here.

Yes, my good Democratic friends of the South, all I suggest is that we develop our abilities in the science of political engineering so that no longer will an imaginary line created by the War Between the States continue to divide into rival political camps people who have an identity of convictions and such close similarities of concept. It would be tragic indeed if a generation that has split the atom and harnessed its great power would let a problem in Semantics—an attachment to labels, tradition, and prejudice—cause us to continue to split people dedicated to identical high principles into rival camps under the comparatively meaningless names "Republican" and "Democrat," so that we are impotent and powerless to harness our great vote power into a single effective voting machine.

OUR 10TH AMENDMENT

I feel that next to our great written Constitution itself, the greatest invention of Americans in the field of self-government was the concept of States rights as set forth in our Bill of Rights by the 10th amendment. Other civilizations and other lands have contributed much toward the evolution and maintenance of human freedom. But it was left to freemen on this continent and in the early formative days of our system of government to establish by the 10th amendment formal recognition of certain inalienable rights of both States and individual citizens which could be transferred to the Central Government only by the voluntary and specific delegation of those powers by those entrusted with them by our Constitution. This, then, is America's greatest contribution to the science of self-government and the endless contest of free citizens versus the Central Government. This, to a great degree, is the great genius of what we call the American system. This, then, we must preserve if our future is to be as resplendent as our past. And, finally, it is this great key to our success that we must support by proper changes in our elective machinery and our political procedures lest those who lack faith in this concept, or who find it a barrier to their ceaseless drives for power succeed in developing too many powers for too strong a Central Government in Washington. It is this challenge which Dixie—and perhaps Dixie alone—can successfully meet by recognizing its dangers soon enough and by taking the indicated steps required to meet and defeat it.

Good friends, I have suggested five possible remedial steps. Others may occur to you. I believe the challenge to all of us is crystal clear. I appreciate your close attention. You have been very kind. I have been very frank. These are days which call for blunt talk and unpleasant truths. I came here neither to try to please you nor to lure you away from your traditional political behavior. I came only to describe what I believe I know and to predict that which I know I fear.

I came especially, however, because I am positive that the people of Dixie can determine America's destiny for the next half century. By so doing you will chart a course for all the world. No other group in America has the homogeneity, the good judgment, the high patriotism, combined with the tremendous vote power of our Southern States. You can have it as you want it. You will get it as you merit it. You can call the tune for Uncle Sam or you can become the victims of inertia and remain docile and impotent while living through a future the nature of which you will have failed to help in fashioning.

In conclusion, let me suggest to you as bankers that you always keep in mind that it is more important to you to help determine what takes place in the polling places of America than what takes place in the teller's cages of your banks. I beg of you to divert some of your great genius and your many talents to the problems I have discussed with

you to the end that we can solve them in the best interests of all America and all Americans. In our country, we must all remember always that there is never anything wrong with America that a single good election will not cure. Likewise, there is no immortality for our freedoms and no security for our property that a single bad election cannot jeopardize and perhaps even terminate.

I salute you as the custodians of our country's future and I wish you well.

Excerpts From Address by Hon. James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania, at Fourth National Convention of the Polish-American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES H. DUFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, excerpts from remarks I made at the Fourth National Convention of the Polish-American Congress, in Philadelphia, on May 30, 1956.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY SENATOR DUFF AT THE FOURTH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS, AT PHILADELPHIA, MAY 30, 1956

In a period when there is the greatest known prosperity in the free world, the horrible and haunting tragedy of our time is that many once free people are now ground under the ruthless heel of a foreign communistic oppressor.

It matters not what the economic well-being of enslaved people behind the Iron Curtain may be. Several thousand years ago Pericles stated the eternal truth when he said: "There can be no happiness without freedom." And no people who have ever known freedom can ever be happy until they regain it again.

It is the devout wish of every American irrespective of national origin, that the wonderfully brave and heroic Polish people may be made happy again by recovering their freedom.

Despite all protests to the contrary, and despite the substitution of a forced smile by Khrushchev and Bulganin for the snarl and hate of Stalin, communism still remains what it has been from the very beginning, a fanatical and godless movement determined to conquer and destroy the government of free people everywhere.

Stalin today stands accused even by the present Communist leaders as a vicious and cruel murderer. Five thousand of his own officers were executed under his orders without trial merely because he was suspicious of their intentions. If any proof were needed, and it is not needed, this admission by present Communist leaders proves beyond any peradventure that 10,000 Polish officers who were captured under a promise of amnesty were ruthlessly and cruelly murdered by the Communist regime under Stalin in World War II.

The present Communist leaders were the disciples and agents for Stalin. They cannot escape the infamy of one of the most horrible violations of the rights of prisoners in all military history. Certainly no confidence and trust can be placed in the word

or promises of men who now defame and downgrade Stalin, who when they were his agents and subordinates did not raise their voice against some of the most infamous acts ever recorded.

If Khrushchev and Bulganin really want world peace, as they repeatedly say they do, the first gesture of sincerity would be to liberate the countries which the Communists have so ruthlessly deprived of their liberties. That would indeed open wide the doors of the whole world to peace.

The only peace the Russians want is peace on the basis of their retention of the conquered countries. Even a thief would be willing to settle with the law if he were permitted to keep untouched all the loot that he had acquired by reason of his violation of the law.

I am aware that one of the main purposes of the Polish Congress is to reestablish Poland as a free and independent nation through the legislative and executive branches of our Government. No purpose could be more commendable and no effort more worthy of the support of all people who believe in freedom and who hate tyranny and oppression.

No group in America understands better than those of Polish descent the horrible menace of Soviet imperialist communism. The ancestral lands of the Poles have been overrun; the government of the people destroyed, all civil and religious rights of the inhabitants violated, and the iron heel of the oppressor felt throughout the length and breadth of the land. All this without cause or provocation or any assertion of the right by the Communists except their greedy desire for power and domination.

What happened in Poland is the pattern of what will happen everywhere unless the continuous advance of communism is brought to a halt.

I salute you in your determination that Poland shall again be free, and I join with you in your prayers that in due time under divine guidance these prayers may be answered.

A Tribute to James T. Hixson, Educator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 2, 1956, the former students of James T. Hixson, for over 50 years a teacher, principal, and leader in the field of secondary education, presented to the Webster Groves, Mo., School District a portrait of Mr. Hixson which is to be hung in the new James T. Hixson Junior High School. On the occasion of the unveiling of this portrait I had the following remarks to make:

Many people talk about the need of more people with talent and the spirit of self-dedication in the field of primary and secondary education. I am satisfied that one way of assisting in bringing about that end is to honor those people who have spent their lives furthering good primary and secondary education.

From time to time the busy society of today pauses to evaluate the lives of its component parts, the men and women who go to make it up. We pay tribute with our lips and our passing thoughts to those who have entered the service professions; but this has not been sufficient to bring enough persons into the pursuit of such dedicated living.

Fortunately, our society has adjusted itself so that many of the service professions bring with them monetary returns as well as, occasionally, fame. We do not need to pause to discuss these more fortunate of the service professions, they have their obvious rewards.

We do need to start paying more deliberate attention to those service professions which remain largely unheralded, if we are to continue to attract to them the number of men and women our society needs. Not the least of these unheralded professions is that of education; and in the field of education an area that most lacks proper public acclaim is primary and secondary education.

Today the higher institutions of learning, through their spokesmen, are proclaiming an easily perceived truth that by and large our secondary school systems throughout the Nation are not turning out the caliber graduate that the higher institutions of learning must count upon. This indicates the need for more persons to dedicate their talents and lives to the problems of secondary education.

We in Webster Groves are blessed by having the highest caliber primary and secondary school products. This has not come about by chance. It comes from the dedicated work of men and women like the man we are honoring today.

All assembled know personally the great, fine, and silent work performed by James T. Hixson in behalf of education in our community, because he was our teacher and our principal. Not all of us may be aware of the influence that this work has had upon education throughout our land and yet this, too, is so.

In a sense we honor ourselves here today by following our natural inclinations to honor this distinguished educator. This fine building dedicated to public education appropriately bears the name of a great educator, James T. Hixson. We his former students now give to the Webster Groves Board of Education a portrait of this man to be placed in this building so that all may know and come to recognize the face of the man who personally gave to us so much. The qualities of a great educator are not limited to the fields of scholastic abilities; they also must encompass those that go toward making daily living among people a pleasant experience. James T. Hixson's scholarship is matched by his humanity, his friendliness, his good Christian character. His is a life to be emulated. It will be an inspiration to the thousands of students who will go through the corridors of this beautiful new junior high school to see the portrait of a man who gave so much to the education of the children of this country. It is fitting that honor should come to him while he is still with us.

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, at Dedication of Eisenhower Lock on the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, yesterday a great milestone of construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway was reached when the Eisenhower Lock was dedicated at Massena, N. Y., at a tremendously impressive ceremony. Sev-

eral significant addresses were delivered on this memorable occasion.

One such address was offered by our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the man who is generally regarded, and rightly so, as the father of the St. Lawrence Seaway law. He was introduced by the Assistant Secretary of the Army, George H. Roderick, who gave a well-deserved tribute to our colleague.

I send to the desk a brief excerpt from Assistant Secretary Roderick's introductory comments, together with the text of Senator WILEY's address. I ask unanimous consent that the text be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and excerpt from the introductory remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM COMMENTS OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY RODERICK

America's part of the St. Lawrence Seaway is running ahead of schedule. That it has advanced this far is in great measure due to the men I will have the honor of presenting to you now.

The first of these is Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin. Senator WILEY, one of the most able and distinguished legislators in the Government, has served continuously in the Senate for almost 20 years. Among his many high posts have been those of the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and delegate to the United Nations General Assembly.

More important on this occasion, however, is the fact that he was one of the two sponsors of the St. Lawrence Seaway bill, which President Eisenhower signed into law in 1954.

He has been called the father of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Senator WILEY had his teeth in the St. Lawrence project for over 17 years. And like a bulldog he held on and on until the Senate passed the bill which makes all this possible.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER LOCK: ENGINEERING FOR ATOMIC PEACE

(Address by Senator WILEY at dedication of Eisenhower Lock, Massena, N. Y.)

This is a great day in the history of Massena.

It is a great day in the lives of the tens of millions of people in the valley of the Great Lakes. It is an historic day in Canadian-American relations; and it is an inspiring day for peoples elsewhere throughout the world.

In the comments which have preceded mine, we have all heard with pleasure of the enormous significance of this lock, and of the other seaway installations to ourselves and to our good neighbor to the north.

Naturally, for those of us Americans who come from areas in the upper lake region, we are particularly looking forward to the completion of work—further up the lakes—on the deepening and improving of the connecting channels. We hope for all possible speed in approval of United States funds for this vital upper lake purpose.

In the meantime, however, we rejoice in the splendid progress, evidenced in every single step in this mighty waterway and power project—every step everywhere along the lakes.

To myself, as one who has been proud to fight for this cause since the time I came to the Senate in 1939, this is indeed a day of real gratification.

And it is, of course, particularly appropriate that this lock be named in honor of our great President, an American and world statesman, who has contributed so much

to the coming into being of this bi-national seaway itself.

In the few moments that I have available, I would like to comment on the significance of the man from Abilene, the distinguished leader in the White House, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

I hope that the cable dispatches to overseas will fully describe our meeting today, for this dedication in his name to the free world. May this news come as further inspiration of what free men can do under Eisenhower-like leadership, and what they will achieve, with cooperation and teamwork.

This is the type of project into which we of North America gladly put our strength and our resources.

This is the only type of engineering we Americans really enjoy—engineering works that advance the well-being of mankind. There is no American, no Canadian—there is no thinking person anywhere in the world—who likes to see the genius of engineering, the genius of construction, devoted to weapons of destruction.

And so may the cables which will be read in Moscow tonight remind the leaders of the Kremlin that it is Dwight D. Eisenhower's and our most fervent hope, it is his and our prayer, that in the months and years up ahead, the people of this world may increasingly devote their energy to the building of other great works of peace.

This lock—this project symbolizes greater good for man—greater prosperity, greater harnessing of the forces of nature, for man's betterment.

It is but a symbol of what we can do and will do on an ever larger scale, in many other fields, particularly if the cloud of nuclear conflict is forever banished from our horizon, as it should and must be.

As one who is privileged to serve as a senior minority member of the United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I hope that the worldwide significance of the event today will be fully noted by all peoples.

Let them note that we proudly apply the illustrious name "Eisenhower" to a mighty engineering lock of peace—not to a tank, not to a missile, not to a bomb.

Why? Because Dwight D. Eisenhower, although he has devoted a life of honored service in the uniform of his country, is a man truly of peace.

He knows that there is no goal in all this world dearer than the twin goal of peace and freedom.

Dwight Eisenhower knows and has said that "There is no alternative to peace." Modern nuclear war could be mutual mass suicide—mass inhuman slaughter—mass destruction of edifices such as this.

That is why it is my earnest hope that we here today who dedicate Dwight D. Eisenhower Lock will simultaneously rededicate ourselves to President Eisenhower's goals—world peace and freedom. But how to achieve those objectives? By continuation and strengthening of our policies of partnership with the free world, by mutual security with all like-minded nations.

These are policies to which our Canadian good neighbor is contributing with outstanding effectiveness.

Perhaps a somewhat brighter day in East-West relations may be ahead. Perhaps, for example, Molotov's resignation may be taken as a further possibility for a bit more—I emphasize—just a bit more of easing of East-West tensions.

But I warn: the whole ominous Soviet record of the past, the record of treachery and doubledealing, the record of e. g. zagging Red policies and waves of purges—this dark record bids us to remain cautious and vigilant.

Meanwhile, however, thanks to the seaway, we are growing stronger with each passing day.

So, congratulations, my friends to all who have contributed to the arrival of this

splendid hour. Congratulations to Administrator Lewis Castle, and to my able colleague, GEORGE DONDERO, and to all those, named and unnamed today, who dreamed great dreams, who worked and toiled and sacrificed that this proud event might come to pass.

Commencement Address Delivered by Hon.

A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia, at Staunton Military Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, four of the most memorable years of my life were spent in the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia where I attended the Staunton Military Academy. The beauty of the surrounding countryside, the historic significance of the area, and most of all, the delightful sincerity and friendship of the people, have remained with me all the intervening years since my graduation. I feel as close to that part of Virginia as I do to my own home, and it is pleasing to me to have my two sons in attendance at that same school, where they, too, will add to their education and to their appreciation of the fineness of Virginia.

Yesterday, the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] delivered the graduation address at my old school, and it carries such a message of importance to the youth of our Nation that I wish to make it available to my colleagues. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRADUATION ADDRESS OF SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON AT THE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, STAUNTON MILITARY ACADEMY, STAUNTON, VA., JUNE 3, 1956

It is a coveted privilege to address the Cadet Corps of one of the best military academies in the Nation, founded by a distinguished Confederate veteran and located in the second oldest city in the Valley of Virginia. While Staunton was not established as a town until 14 years before the Revolutionary War, it has been the county seat of Augusta County since 1745. At the present time, Augusta is just the second largest county in Virginia but when it was first created it was larger than the present State of Virginia because it extended to the Mississippi River, including all of what is now the State of Kentucky and the State of West Virginia, and even a small part of what is now the State of Pennsylvania.

I once heard a distinguished Staunton lawyer, Col. Rudolph Bumgardner, deliver an address which recounted a trip that George Washington made on horseback from Mount Vernon to Staunton after he had finished his second term as President. He first examined his land titles which were recorded in the clerk's office of Staunton and then proceeded through what is now West Virginia where he owned large tracts and into Pennsylvania where he also had holdings in what is now called Washington County, named by the grateful citizens of

that Pennsylvania area for George Washington because when a boundary dispute arose between Virginia and Pennsylvania over who owned the land Washington urged the Virginia Legislature to cede it to Pennsylvania saying that Virginia would still have plenty left. And I am sure in your course on American history you learned that the first Declaration of Independence was adopted at a mass meeting in Augusta County and you also will recall that Washington said during the Revolutionary War, when many of his followers had gotten faint hearted: "Leave me but a banner to place upon the mountains of Augusta, and I will rally around me the men who will lift our bleeding country from the dust and set her free."

Augusta County furnished many brave soldiers for Washington's army and many brave soldiers to Stonewall Jackson's army of northern Virginia. It was, therefore, highly fitting and proper that William H. Kable, who later served as a captain in the Confederate army, selected Staunton as the site for a military academy, the primary aim of which was the development of character, of personal integrity and unselfish service. And needless to say, during my 23 years of service in the Congress, first as the Representative of this valley district, and since 1946, as the junior Senator from Virginia, I always have taken pride in saying that the Valley of Virginia is as fertile as the Valley of the Nile but more centrally located and that Staunton is a wonderfully fine place to send either a boy to get an education combined with military training or a girl to get an education and instruction in the art of gracious living. Incidentally, my mother graduated from Staunton Female Institute, now named for the greatest of all southern cavalry leaders, "Jeb" Stuart.

The goal Captain Kable set for character training at Staunton Military Academy has been kept constantly in sight by those who succeeded him in the leadership of this school, as is evidenced by the fact that its catalog says the aim of the academy is to send its students out into the larger world of adult life "with trained minds and bodies, adequate cultural resources, high personal ideals, and a sense of responsibility to society."

In looking over this catalog recently I was pleased to notice the personal word to parents, in effect warning them not to send boys here if they are looking for no more than military discipline which would harden bodies and mental discipline which would prepare minds for meeting college entrance requirements.

Those goals also could be achieved in a Communist school and, as a matter of fact, we have reason to believe that the educational system of the Soviet Union compares most favorably with the general run of schools in the United States in the fields of physical and scientific training.

Former Senator William Benton, who is publisher of the Encyclopedia Britannica, recently made a startling report on his personal observations of education in Russia. He said education has become a main theater of the cold war and that Russia's classrooms, libraries, laboratories, and teaching methods may threaten us more than her hydrogen bombs and guided missiles.

Benton said all children in Russia are required to attend school between the ages of 7 and 17 and that the standards of academic accomplishment set for them are higher than the best American high schools and would be comparable to the level of a junior college in the United States.

The Russian boys and girls go to school 6 days a week and 10 months a year. In addition to studying the three R's and algebra, geometry, and trigonometry, they are required to take 4 or 5 years of physics, 4 years of chemistry, 2 of biology, 1 of astron-

omy, 1 of psychology, and 6 years of a foreign language, preferably English.

After completing this general schooling graduates may go to 1 of 2,000 vocational colleges which train specialists for industry and technicians in the fields of medicine, education, and the arts or they may go to 1 of 800 institutions of higher learning which train engineers, doctors, dentists, lawyers, advanced scientists, and teachers.

But the objective of this system of education is not to train individuals for a life of happiness or to fulfill their potential in a free society. It is to discipline them for maximum service to the state. Teachers are given no academic freedom, nor are they allowed to criticize the political regime of the country or any official dogma. Students not only are required to follow prescribed courses in school but, once they have picked a particular profession and started training, they cannot change their minds about entering it and after graduation they must work 3 years at any assigned job. That last requirement, incidentally, might well be brought to the attention of any young man in America who considers it a hardship to be called for a limited period of service to prepare himself to help defend his country against any future attack.

Now, if our goals were the same as those of the Russians and the graduates of Staunton Military Academy were called upon to compete directly with the graduates of their schools, I believe the boys trained here would acquit themselves with honor. I know that this academy was the first school in the South to be rated by the War Department as an honor school on the basis of the military aptitude, training, and efficiency of its ROTC unit. I know also that in one of the recent yearly examinations given in all the honor schools in the United States to select 10 boys to enter the Naval Academy at Annapolis, with each school permitted to name 3 candidates, all 3 of the Staunton nominees won appointments—a record equaled by no other school. And I know, also, the school's record for winning football championships.

I am thankful, however, that the goal of Staunton Military Academy is not the same as that of the Russian schools and that parents considering sending their boys here are specifically told in advance: "We cannot be satisfied with the fostering of only mental and physical accomplishments. Our higher trust is to instill in the boy a sense of responsibility, encourage in him a respect for the soundest virtues and, through a discipline which is firm, kind, and just, to teach him the art of self-discipline." Self-discipline, as Henderson said of Stonewall Jackson, is the root of all manliness.

It is primarily to commend that attitude toward education that I have come here today.

We live in an age in which man's ingenuity in the physical sciences has enabled him to produce weapons capable of wiping out civilization and there are some who believe that destructive result cannot be avoided. They have seen a generation which triumphed over one form of totalitarianism at the cost of unleashing the atom bomb now confronted by a more dangerous form of totalitarianism which has been held in check only by the threat of the hydrogen bomb. But, since the totalitarians also have that weapon now, and do not have our scruples to deter its use, there is ample ground for pessimism about the ultimate result.

I am not personally willing to concede, however, that men are now powerless to control their own inventions or that it already is too late to choose any road other than the one which leads to destruction of civilization. The start which this Nation had in development of weapons of total destruction and the means of delivering them anywhere in the world has bought us time. In the words of Sir Winston Churchill, they

were sanctions which have preserved an uneasy peace. All the free nations of the world fervently hope for a program of international disarmament and a lessening of the heavy burden of defense spending, and even the nations behind the Iron Curtain pay lip service to such proposals. Until they evidence their good intentions with respect to peaceful coexistence by deeds, such, for instance, as the release of East Germany and withdrawal from Korea, we cannot afford to let down our guard. But while maintaining a defensive power well calculated to stay the hand of a possible aggressor every effort must be made to bring into line the spiritual forces on which ultimate victory will depend.

Commenting on why the United States entered the First World War one of our distinguished Federal jurists, Judge Learned Hand, said we were not so much afraid of a physical German invasion, if they won, as we were that the example of totalitarian success would convert mankind, including Americans, to a discipline after the German pattern. "Not the violence of enemies would undo us," he said, "but our own spiritual weakness, the shallowness of our convictions."

That statement, I believe, reflects the thinking of that great native of Staunton, Woodrow Wilson, who in 1917 sincerely sought an honorable alternative to war and was unable to find it; and when the war was over tried unsuccessfully to show us the road to a lasting peace based on spiritual strength.

Another Federal judge, Harold R. Medina, who studied under Wilson at Princeton, recalled recently some of the things he learned there which had made the most lasting impression on him.

He said Woodrow Wilson had taught three things:

"(1) That American democracy could not function properly without a constant renewal of its leadership from the rank and file, the men and women who today are boys and girls trying to get some sort of an education.

"(2) Colleges do not exist for the purpose of sharpening our wits for our own use, but rather to quicken our social understanding, instruct our consciences, and develop in us what he called a 'taste of unselfishness and self-sacrifice.'

"(3) Ideals and moral principles are 'of the very spirit of all action,' and we are put in this world not to twiddle our thumbs but to act."

Again in World War II our greatest danger was not a German invasion but worldwide acceptance of the principles for which Hitler and Mussolini stood. Under that system, of course, there could be no such constitutional democracy as we now have, based on recognition of individual worth.

And today, as I indicated when I told of Senator Benton's observation of Russian education, our greatest danger is not that our cities will be wiped out by hydrogen bombs but that we shall be pressed by economic and psychological weapons to the point where a minimum security guaranteed by government seems preferable to the risks and gains of private initiative—where we yield our civic and social responsibilities to a centralized bureaucratic authority and where the despotic figure of a paternalistic state blocks our vision of the dignity of man.

One of our chief bulwarks against that threat must be schools and colleges which, like Staunton Military Academy, pledge themselves "to promote the ideals of personal integrity and unselfish service." And I know of no city and no institution better equipped by heritage and tradition to carry on that program than Staunton and its military academy.

In 1864, just 4 years after this school was founded, the streets of Staunton echoed with the unusual sound of a nursery song played by a military band and sung by hardened soldiers.

In that dark hour for the Confederate cause the VMI cadets had been summoned from nearby Lexington to help defend Staunton. Although they were of college grade, records show that those boys were little older than the present students of SMA. The average age was 18, and 4 of them were just past 15. Their youthful appearance amused the older soldiers quartered in Staunton, and when one veteran detachment's band started playing Rock-a-Bye Baby the men took up the air, singing and rocking their guns as if putting a baby to sleep.

Two days later, however, those boys made their famed charge at New Market, and as they marched to the front, past the weary veterans they were relieving, there was no derision but rather an admiring shout of "Look at the seed corn battalion, look, look."

At New Market and elsewhere during that sad, fratricidal war much of the seed corn of southern youth was lost, and after nearly a century we have barely recovered from that sacrifice of young manhood. As a compensating factor, however, we have profited by examples of irrefragable courage and self-sacrifice that will never die.

The spirit which led the boys of VMI to New Market as volunteers in defense of their native State not only has been perpetuated at VMI, but it has been stimulated wherever their story was known. Robert E. Lee, at Washington and Lee University, and William H. Kable, at Staunton Military Academy, set the pattern for training the kind of leadership a Republic demands. Woodrow Wilson carried that concept from Staunton to Princeton, and in his writings and speeches urged it upon our Nation and the free world.

I congratulate you, who are graduating today, on the privilege of sharing a great tradition, and I charge you to apply the ideals of personal integrity and unselfish service to every duty that may be required of you, remembering:

So nigh is grandeur to our dust,
So near is God to man,
When duty whispers low, thou must,
The youth replies, I can.

Memorandum on Kearns Bill, H. R. 10424

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I submit the following memorandum on my bill, H. R. 10424, which would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the excise tax on television receivers capable of receiving 50 or more ultra-high frequency television channels:

COMMITTEE FOR COMPETITIVE TELEVISION,
Washington, D. C.

MEMORANDUM ON KEARNS BILL, H. R. 10424

In order to achieve an all-channel television system it is essential that receiving sets at manufacturer's level be built as all-channel sets. Because of the inept manner in which allocations were made at the outset by the Government, it is now essential that the Government help to correct the error by creating an excise tax differential between all-channel sets and VHF-only sets at the manufacturer's level.

This is the purpose of H. R. 10424, and the following facts relate to the tax effect of that bill which provides a 5 percent reduction

in the excise tax on television sets capable of receiving 50 or more UHF television channels:

The average cost at manufacturer's level before taxes of all-channel sets is currently \$134 per unit.

The average cost at manufacturer's level of VHF-only sets is currently \$120 per unit. It is estimated that all sets costing at manufacturer's level \$129 or more would be manufactured as all-channel sets if there were a tax differential of 5 percent.

It is estimated that this would cause the manufacture of 50 percent of present VHF-only sets as all-channel sets. It would affect 3,300,000 sets.

In addition, in 1955 there were manufactured 1,181,000 all-channel sets.

The reduction of revenues from the 5 percent differential would be as following, presuming 1956 and later production would be approximately on the 1955 basis:

Value of 1,181,000 UHF sets....	\$160,000,000
Present excise tax, 10 percent....	16,000,000
Kearns bill, loss, 5 percent.....	8,000,000
Value of 3,300,000 UHF sets....	425,000,000
Present excise tax, 10 percent....	42,500,000
Kearns bill, loss, 5 percent.....	21,250,000
Total loss.....	29,250,000

However, this loss would be offset by at least a 10 percent increase in set market as a result of increased stations. This will amount to approximately \$6 million. In addition, the present UHF stations will have increased revenues. If this were to be an average taxable revenue of only \$100,000 per station, there would be a gain to the Government of \$5 million. The advent of new stations to the extent of only 400 stations with taxable income per station of only \$50,000 would increase tax revenues by \$20,000 per station or \$10 million. All of these taxes would create a recoupment of \$21 million per annum.

Additional employment of taxable employees, additional revenue to networks, and additional orders to manufacturers for transmitting equipment and receivers will all generate more taxable income than could be lost by the Government.

Therefore, the Government would under the Kearns bill gain revenue rather than lose it.

The foregoing is based on facts and figures supplied by the Statistical Division of Radio-Electronics-Television Manufacturers Association.

The Fault in the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the fault in the armed services is not that the top brass in the Army, Air Force, and Navy—at the moment primarily the Army and the Air Force—disagree and are arguing publicly as to which is the more important in preserving our national security; as to which should receive a major portion of available funds for the development of the weapons or equipment which it considers to be advisable or necessary; as to which service should be entrusted with the performance of a particular function.

The reason for and the purpose of the armed services is to maintain a front which will deter any potential enemy from attacking us and, in the event it fails in that, then to defeat that enemy quickly and with the least possible loss of life.

From the very beginning, individuals in the Army and the Navy disagreed as to the roles and missions which each was best qualified to perform in defense of our country. Naturally, when the Air Force came of age, the controversy was intensified.

Beyond doubt, the Navy needed carrier-based fighting air equipment to protect and make successful its operations. This was demonstrated in the last war. Experience also demonstrated that the ground forces needed air coverage if they were to fight successfully.

One has but to read the history put out by the armed services to realize that in World War II and in the Korean war each service was dependent upon the others for successful operation. Unified action by all three is necessary if we are to survive.

It is only natural that patriotic, ambitious, aggressive individuals in each service should, as do experts or specialists in any other human activity, become obsessed with the idea that their branch of the service is the most important, the best qualified to give us effective national defense. That is a healthy and desirable situation, for it keeps everyone on his toes. It leads to progress and the acquisition of the best.

Nor does any harm result unless one branch becomes unfairly, unduly, critical of the other. Even then the remedy is at hand. We have not only Joint Chiefs of Staff, but we have a Commander in Chief who can, figuratively speaking, knock the heads of even the generals together and tell them just how far to go.

In addition, back of it all, sits the Congress which, while its individual Members may know very little about what each service should do, is supposed to possess commonsense and, sitting as a jury, decide upon the testimony of the experts, not what each branch should do in peacetime or in war, but how far the country can go in spending money for national defense without destroying our security through bankruptcy.

As I see it, the fault in the armed services is that because of the technical training of its officers—they get into the academies when they are 20 or 21—they have never learned, they do not realize the efforts which the taxpayers must put forth to earn and contribute the dollars which the services spend. Hence, millions are wasted because of duplication in purchasing common items, because of the lack of unified effort to keep down the cost of overall national defense.

With 52 percent of the national income being spent for national defense—and this year we are giving the armed services something like \$34½ billion, in addition to a holdover of some \$20 billion—the top brass should have impressed upon it the realization that we can spend ourselves into insecurity as well as becoming insecure through lack of preparation.

Report to the People of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report to the people of Wisconsin by the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] concerning East-West trade.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR McCARTHY'S REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF WISCONSIN

Our committee (the Senate Subcommittee on Investigations) has just completed an investigation of current, United States-authorized strategic trade with the Communist nations. Since most newspapers have printed few, if any, of the hair-raising details of the committee's findings, I thought I should bring the principal facts to your attention.

The long and short of the matter is that you, the American taxpayer, are subsidizing the construction of the Communist war machine. This conclusion is inescapable since you are footing the bill for billions of dollars of American aid to so-called friendly nations, that, in turn, are supplying highly strategic war materials to the Soviet war economy.

The committee's investigation of this matter began in 1954 under my chairmanship and has continued up to the present in the face of strenuous efforts by the executive branch to keep the story from Congress and the American people. The committee discovered that in August 1954 our Government made secret concessions to our allies as regards what they could ship to the Communist bloc without losing American aid. As a result of these concessions, over 200 highly strategic items—such as machine tools, metals, and electronics, transportation and electrical equipment—were removed from the anti-Communist embargo.

I list below a few examples of the materials we agreed to let countries receiving United States aid ship to Soviet Russia, together with an indication of their strategic value.

Electric power generators up to 60,000 kilowatts, turbines up to 85,000 horsepower, and motors up to 12,500 horsepower: This electrical equipment is used in making fissionable material for atom and hydrogen bombs.

Horizontal boring mills: These machine tools, which cost between \$200,000 and \$500,000 each, are used in making tanks, artillery weapons, aircraft, and atomic reactors such as those used on the submarine *Nautilus*.

Vertical-boring mills: Essential in making jet engines.

Dynamic balancing machines: Used in making jet engines and guided missiles.

External cylindrical grinding machines: Used in making guided missiles and radar equipment.

Surface grinding machines: Used in making jet engine parts, guided missiles, radar equipment, and diesel engines.

High precision boring mills: Used in making jet engine and guided missile parts.

Copper wire: Next to fissionable materials, copper is the single most strategic metal. Thousands of miles of copper wire, for example, go into the engine of every bomber.

Aluminum: Indispensable in making aircraft.

Nickel alloys up to 30 percent: Used in making aircraft parts and tanks.

Molybdenum alloys up to 20 percent: Used in making jet aircraft parts.

Magnesium: Used in aircraft construction and in foot-soldier equipment.

In return for these highly strategic war materials, the Communists are shipping to the free world butter, cotton, and woodpulp.

The American people were not informed of these secret concessions to our allies; indeed, deliberate and (until our committee got on the track) successful attempts were made to conceal them. Here is how the strategic trade agreements were reported to the Nation by Harold Stassen, who was the central figure in the negotiations. The agreements, Stassen announced in the summer of 1954, "will result in a net advantage to the free world of expanded peaceful trade and more effective control of the war potential items."

Not content with misleading statements of a general nature, Mr. Stassen resorted to specific falsification when, as Battle Act Administrator, he made his annual report to Congress in November 1954. The following is a paragraph from Mr. Stassen's report: "Minerals and metals of basic importance to the Soviet military power such as aluminum, copper, nickel, molybdenum, cobalt, magnesium, tungsten, and titanium remain on the * * * embargo list."

Mr. Stassen's statement, with respect to aluminum, copper wire, magnesium, and alloys of nickel and molybdenum was, simply, untrue.

The seriousness of our concessions can be appreciated by taking a closer look at just one of the items being shipped to the Communists—copper. Mr. Stassen said that copper was still embargoed. He was right about unprocessed copper, but he failed to mention that the finished product, in the form of highly strategic copper wire, was taken off the embargo. The committee then learned the following additional facts: (a) Since August 1954, when the embargo was relaxed, over 200 million pounds of copper wire have been shipped to the Soviet bloc by countries receiving United States aid; (b) the principal shipper is Britain; (c) the United States is providing a direct subsidy to British copper mines in Rhodesia; moreover (d) copper is on the United States critical stockpile list, and because it is in short supply in this country, we found it necessary during 1954 and 1955 to divert 150 million pounds of copper from our strategic stockpile for industrial use. In other words, although copper is badly needed in this country for our own war potential, we are giving the British money to mine copper, which they then turn around and sell to the Communists.

Congress provided in the Battle Act of 1951 that the President must immediately terminate United States aid to nations that ship materials of "primary strategic significance" to the Communists—or that he must immediately explain to Congress why he is not doing so. In this case, aid was not cut off, nor were the facts of the 1954 embargo revision transmitted to Congress. The way Mr. Stassen, as Battle Act Administrator, got around the Battle Act was to determine that certain obviously strategic items were not of "primary strategic importance"—despite the fact they had been so regarded in the past. The executive branch thus brazenly defied the clear intent of Congress.

Later on in this session, Congress will be asked to appropriate some \$5 billion for aid to nations that are now shipping the Communists strategic war materials. I intend to oppose that appropriation unless it is accompanied by an airtight guaranty that American money will not be used in the future to build the Communist war machine.

I should add that the executive branch is now studying British demands to relax the embargo against Red China. These demands must be resisted. I trust you agree

with me that trading with any of our enemies, in any goods whatsoever, is contrary to American interests.

Conference on Occupational Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, there was recently concluded here in Washington a nationwide conference on industrial safety. This conference was called by President Eisenhower, who addressed the opening session in a speech which I should like to include at this point:

Mr. Secretary, ladies, and gentlemen, the concentration of 3,000 people here in the city of Washington to conduct a conference on this problem of occupational safety is the most heartwarming experience I have yet had in my months of examination into this problem.

I want personally to thank each of you for the interest you are taking in it. I want to congratulate you for the simple reason that I know that out of this conference will spring the greatest advance we have yet made in this field.

Now, on the highways we know we lose a tremendous number of our people each year—I believe 38,000 were killed last year. The number we lose through occupational accidents is not so large, but in a way it is more tragic.

In the one case we have many millions of fast-moving units on the road with no possibility of coordinated control among them, except as they may choose to obey the laws in the areas in which they are driving.

In this occupational field we have much of our trouble arising in organized bodies and groups, in our factories and other places. Through proper spread of information, proper adoption of methods and procedures, we know that much of this could be eliminated. In other words, the 14,000 that we lose through occupational accidents seems to be more easily controllable within limits, at least, than does the other.

I don't know how many of the individuals in this audience have ever had the task—almost the daily task—of writing letters of condolence to families that have lost a dear one. For my part, I assure you, it is one of the most heartbreaking things I have ever had to do. And when you stop to think of 14,000 bereaved families in this country every year, occasioned by preventable accidents, it is indeed, to such a person as myself, a tragic fact.

So I believe that such people as yourselves have the solution largely in your hands. The Federal Government can do little. The President can call a conference to bring you together so that you may exchange ideas; so that each of you may gain some inspiration from the fact that so many people do come to look into this thing and show their determination to do something about it.

But the Federal Government's part here is limited very definitely to that of a general leadership. Federal law and Federal Government should not extend into the factory, into the farm, into the other places where these accidents occur. The community and the State, therefore, must pick up the burden of teaching, of devising, of planning, so that this tragedy is certainly lessened in extent and comes as close to the point of elimination as human ingenuity can bring it.

This is a short description of the feelings I had when, with Secretary Mitchell, we determined to invite you to this particular conference.

I again say, I thank you from the bottom of my heart for coming.

I have every confidence that from today forward, from the moment you return home, we will begin to show improvement, and we will improve all the time, each year, until practical elimination has been achieved.

Each of you will share in the great satisfaction that will come from that development. I for my part, expect that I will look back on this day for a long time as one of the finest things that has happened for America in this line.

It is a serious problem, but as they used to say in the war when people would complain about how tough this particular job was: "Well, if it wasn't tough, they wouldn't have brought such good men to do it."

I say that to you.

Goodbye and good luck.

Mr. Speaker, that same day the Secretary of Labor, James P. Mitchell, also addressed the Conference. In both these speeches the need was stressed for our people to give greater attention to the increasingly serious problem of occupational safety. Although the role of the Federal Government in this field may not be crucial, certain legislation is desirable. On April 25 of last year, I introduced H. R. 5740, which would provide certain assistance to States in their efforts to promote industrial safety. Although no action has yet been taken on this bill, it is my hope that Congress, through the appropriate committees, will consider this whole question in the near future.

Mr. Mitchell's address follows:

I am happy to welcome this vast audience to the fifth and largest President's Conference on Occupational Safety. I particularly want to greet the several new groups who are here for the first time this year. When we started this Conference, we concentrated by general agreement on certain segments of our economy—manufacturing, construction, utilities, trade and service, finance and government. This year we invited the Department of Agriculture and the farming community to join us. Increasing mechanization and greater use of chemicals have drawn farm safety problems close to those of industry. They have responded generously and we are very happy to welcome them. I hope this year's addition will stimulate future Conferences to invite the 1 or 2 remaining groups which are still not included.

This year for the first time we have invited leaders of the major religious organizations and women's groups to attend. We believe their knowledge of, and influence over, human motivation will help us discover what it is that makes a man take care of his own safety and that of others. In industry, labor, and government, we have developed many techniques and made much progress but workers continue to be killed and maimed. Something more is needed. The experts suspect we must find that something in the elusive wellsprings of human motivation. If anyone can help us with that quest, we believe it should be these groups whom we have asked to join us this year.

I ask all to consider with me for a few minutes what is the Nation's stake in occupational safety. Concern for human dignity is a tenet upon which our Republic was founded. The worth and well-being of the individual should determine all of our activities. Our first stake is to protect that well-being against needless suffering and pain. Our second concern is to maintain a high production and avoid economic waste.

Our third is directly related to our survival in competitive coexistence with our enemies in the world. Despite record employment levels today, we face dangerous shortages of skilled workers, not only scientists, but maintenance men, repairmen, mechanics, electronics experts, and many others.

When a jet aviator is killed, we know what we have lost in human and economic terms—not only a fine American boy who is lost to his family and his country, but whose intelligence and imagination, nurtured in freedom, gives us our qualitative superiority in the air. We are less aware of the loss sustained by death or injury to the man whose skill in maintaining the magic instrument box that keeps the pilot's B-47 jet effective in the air. In addition to his life and skill, and in addition to the untold suffering and anguish caused by injury, the loss of one repairman of these instrument boxes through occupational death or injury costs the Government an investment of 4 years and \$22,500 in training, pay and allowances. We cannot afford this waste.

This is a dramatic instance of the importance of safety to world peace and survival. Every work injury is worse than one by enemy action because it is preventable.

Four decades of experience by industry, labor, and Government have taught us how to prevent over 90 percent of all work accidents. Despite that progress, last year 14,200 workers were killed and nearly 2 million injured on the job. These are not statistics—but the casualty list of our American economy in the peacetime year of 1955. We are shocked by newspaper headlines of a great disaster. Yet three times as many workers died on the job last year as in the Chicago fire, the Boston Coconut Grove night club fire, the Hartford circus fire, the sinking of the *Titanic*, the Johnstown flood, and the San Francisco earthquake combined.

That tremendous suffering of these workers and their families is immeasurable, and naturally transcends any economic losses involved. But the economic loss can be estimated, and is a factor with which businessmen must reckon. A rough estimate by one of our large insurance companies sets the employer's cost of a work injury at four times the cost of compensation. When a man is killed or permanently disabled, his production is lost not only at the time of the accident but for years to come. The 1955 work injuries cost our Nation a total of 193 million man-days of output—enough to produce 100 million refrigerators or cut and make 200 million men's suits, or make $1\frac{1}{2}$ billion pairs of men's shoes, or fabricate more than 26,000 jet bombers, or build a million 6-room houses, or mine 2 billion tons of coal.

We can estimate, too, what a work injury will cost a worker in wages. For example, the average factory worker earned \$76.52 a week in 1955. Suppose he were single and suffered a work injury in the State of Oregon. He would have lost \$216.59 a month in wages. If he were married, he would have lost \$191.99 a month. Suppose he were an average building craftsman earning \$96.39 a week. If injured in Oregon and single, he would have lost \$302.69 in wages each month; if married, \$277.69. Maximum weekly benefits under the Oregon law—an unusually liberal one—would allow these injured men to live on only 30 to 40 percent of their previous monthly income. What would you and I do, if ill, in pain, and uncertain of our future earning capacity, we had to reduce our monthly living expenses by 60 to 70 percent?

This suffering and these costs need not happen. The Labor Department knows of 12 machinery plants which suffered less than one disabling injury per million man-hours worked in 1954. One such plant recorded 2.3 million hours without a disabling injury. On the other hand we know of 11 large plants with more than 1,000 employees each which suffered over 25 disabling injuries per mil-

lion hours. If 12 plants can produce such a fine record, there is no reason why all the others can't also.

A frequency rate of 5 injuries per million man-hours is considered by most safety experts as very good. It is thoroughly practical. It has been achieved by many plants. Do you realize that if we could achieve that rate wherever people work in the United States, we would have had $1\frac{1}{4}$ million fewer injuries last year? With that completely achievable rate, we would have prevented two-thirds of our reported injuries. We would have had 238,000 fewer injuries in manufacturing, 225,000 fewer in trade, 228,000 fewer in agriculture.

How can we go about achieving such a rate? That's what this conference is for. Our problem is to convince those firms, who do not think safety is important or who think they cannot afford it, that safety is good business. A sound safety program pays the best dividends in the world.

How can we reach these firms? One way is through State labor departments who know the nonagricultural firms in their States. These departments are recognizing more and more that they cannot depend upon law alone to prevent accidents. Most work injuries today do not violate law but arise from a variety of other causes. The modern concept of a State labor department's service to industry is no longer that of a policeman but of a friendly and highly trained consultant.

If a State labor department is to realize this modern concept, if it is to build a competent, technical service, it needs the support of all of us. Governor Langle will, I am sure, have a good deal to say about this today. What he has been able to achieve in Washington State can point the way for us all.

Another way to reach the unawakened firm is through community action. This, too, will be discussed tomorrow afternoon. That community safety programs can be effective is shown by one heavily industrialized county in Ohio whose 92 reporting firms—mostly engaged in fabricating iron and steel products—came up with a combined frequency rate of 5.5 last year. The Trumbull County Industrial Safety Committee has been at this game for a quarter century and had reduced their injury rate 75 percent in that time. They have the support of top management, the Ohio Industrial Commission, and their County Foremen's Club. Were they satisfied with their 5.5 frequency last year? No. Their goal had been "under 5 in 1955." So this year their goal is "4.6 in 1956." In 1955 they had an exposure of over $6\frac{1}{4}$ million man-hours and 29 of their 92 firms had perfect records—a frequency rate of 0.

How did they accomplish this? You can read their story in your complimentary conference issue of Safety Standards. Nor are they unique in Ohio. There are a number of similar community industrial safety programs throughout the State. I'm sure we can learn much from them that we can take back home and, I hope, put into practice.

Another way to reach the unawakened is by developing public understanding and support. At the 1954 conference you suggested we should utilize all the media of communication and that we have tried this year to do. President Eisenhower designated this week as Job Safety Week and called upon all citizens to join him in making it a success. This conference is the climax of the week. A number of Governors have issued similar proclamations and we are most grateful for the generous way in which they have helped bring before the people the importance of saving human life and limb in the workplaces of America. As the Federal Government's contribution to this observance the Federal Safety Council is sponsoring

No Accident Week and using it as an occasion to stimulate safety meetings, training, and other safety activities.

In many other ways, we are trying to follow your suggestions of 2 years ago. They are all designed to reach men and women in every walk of life and arouse them to the horror of needless work injury and the necessity to preventing it. In a word, we go back to the community, to the neighborhood where people live and work. America's economic and social progress starts in the community, in the grassroots. The home is vitally important in motivating a safe community.

Fortunately the home was the one major area which last year reduced accidents, according to the National Safety Council. Safety in the home can influence safety at work, at school, on the highway, in the community. In other words, a safe home atmosphere reaches out into every activity of human life. Let us discover and utilize every motivation there is. Let us incorporate safety into our daily life. Let us apply the skills that made this Nation an industrial giant to the problem of making it safe.

Spiritual Strength in the Cold War Struggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 27, our distinguished colleague from Ohio, the Honorable MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, addressed the second annual communion and breakfast of the United States Information Agency here in Washington at the Washington Hotel.

In his address Mr. FEIGHAN made a scholarly and practical analysis of the cold war and the relation of our great spiritual ideals to a winning program of the United States Information Agency.

Under leave granted, I include Mr. FEIGHAN's address on this occasion:

It is a pleasure for me to join with you in this, the second annual communion and breakfast of the United States Information Agency.

As many of you know, I have maintained over the years a keen interest in the program carried out by the information agency.

It has been my good fortune to have an early understanding of the real meaning of the cold war because of my equal good fortune of having knowledge of the real nature of communism at a very early age in my life.

I am one with Father Edmund Walsh, S. J., in the belief that the hotter we make the logistics of the cold war, the colder becomes the possibilities of a hot war.

The work in which you are engaged has a vital bearing upon the question of war or peace.

In your daily work, you do your best to contribute to the United States Worldwide Campaign of Truth.

Such a campaign of truth can do much to dispel the ignorance on which evil seeds of hatred and vengeance thrive.

Hatred and vengeance in turn are the architects of war. Truth is the architect of a just and lasting peace.

It is most fitting, therefore, that you, the Catholic employees of the USIA should have an annual corporate communion and breakfast.

Such an occasion as this provides a singular opportunity for a rededication to those great spiritual truths upon which civilization is based.

It also provides a splendid opportunity to gain added spiritual strength for the difficult tasks that are certain to confront your work in the immediate months ahead.

There can be no doubt that the world of our day is besieged by a force far more evil than any other in all of recorded history.

The struggle for the world is one in which the forces of human freedom and the forces of atheistic communism are locked in a death struggle.

This is fundamentally a conflict of ideas and ideals.

We believe that man is a creature of God, and as such possesses a special dignity, an immortal soul, and that in the hereafter every man must account for his stewardship on earth.

On the other hand, communism teaches that man is an animal, very little different from a horse or a pig.

Communism also teaches that all life ends with mortal death, that there is no hereafter, and consequently no accounting for a stewardship on earth.

It follows that material values are all that count with those who subscribe to the doctrine of communism.

This accounts in very large measure for the unequalled record of inhumanity to man established in the name of communism.

It is this irreconcilable difference in ideals and ideas which lies at the basis of the international conflict between communism and free people. Those who take part in the conflict in defense of our cause of human dignity and freedom must themselves be worthy representatives of our highest ideals.

There is no room for the materialists in the camp of human dignity and freedom.

They can only weaken our cause and dissipate the prospects for a just and lasting peace.

But there is unlimited room in the camp of human dignity and freedom for all those who believe that man lives not by bread alone and that things of the spirit are, in the end, what make life worth living.

And while we keep open the way for all men of good will to participate in the fight for universal justice and decency, it would do us well to ever bear in mind what the persecutors of the early Christians said about them—"See how they love one another."

The work in which you are engaged is in many respects novel—at least it is new to the American scene.

Consequently you must expect a great deal of criticism and very little appreciation for your efforts. It may be many years from now before due accord is given to much of the good work you are now doing. This, it seems, has been the lot of many great and necessary causes down through history.

I underscore great and necessary because those are the only causes that draw strong fire and criticism. Bearing this in mind, you must not become discouraged no matter how difficult the task ahead may seem or how strong the criticism leveled against your efforts to pursue and expand a worldwide campaign of truth.

In somewhat recent years your work has become more difficult because of the burdens and obstacles created by indifference, expediency, and the growing attitude of laissez faire.

The do-nothing attitude which we see on many sides today springs from the false notion that if we do nothing, we will make no mistakes, and if we make no mistakes, we will avoid public criticism.

This is an attitude which must be completely rejected from the important work in which you are engaged.

Leadership demands a try at the unusual or unique and consequently expects honest mistakes will be made. Real leadership sees its mistakes and corrects them.

That is the kind of leadership which must always be given to the cause of human freedom or else individual liberty as we know it, will perish from the world.

I am reminded of an experience I had last November during the course of an inspection trip in Korea. I attended mass at an Army chapel and as I entered the church, I was handed a small leaflet which announced the masses for the week, the feast days of the week, and other items of interest to the military post. But down at the bottom of this little leaflet, prepared by a chaplain assigned to work close to the front lines of freedom, was this timely admonition to all those who attended mass that morning: "The greatest sin of all is doing nothing."

More and more we are hearing the idea advanced that the only workable formula for easing international tension is to approach the Communists in the spirit of live and let live.

The spirit of live and let live is so fundamental to all established religions that it naturally has great appeal to everyone.

This formula if followed would create a situation in which those who believe in moral principles make great concessions to those who are in fact amoral, and whose basic doctrine holds that if needs be three-fourths of the people of the world must perish in order that communism will triumph.

This presents a very serious dilemma for us as we seek to preserve our great moral principles and at the same time prevent the destruction of civilization by the forces of atheistic communism.

We are also being urged to adopt a policy of forgive and forget in our dealings with the Russian Communists.

Here again all established religions teach the necessity of forgiving our transgressors and forgetting misdeeds of the past in the hope that good works will result in the future. But unfortunately the Communists seek to use these moral principles to cause us to forget the many nations and people enslaved by them and who today suffer the trials of the martyr.

In conscience we can never forget the victims of communism any more than we can forget the moral principles which, if adhered to, will prevent the continuance of the many crimes against humanity committed in the name of communism.

In my judgment, we should be quick to forgive and prepared to forget only when the Communists have corrected their evil practices upon humanity and have removed their apparatus of fear and terror from those vast areas of the world which they now hold by force alone.

Another notion being advanced as a solution to the crisis which now grips the world is that we who are free can safely cohabitate with those who seek to enslave us and that if we will be patient and agree to a mixture of what we believe in with that of what the Communists teach, there will evolve over a period of years a new civilization.

This is called the new political evolution. It presupposes that by some accident of nature, evil can be mixed with decency and that the future civilization it heralds can be at the same time both good and evil.

The misguided advocates of this unworkable concept of political evolution have not learned that it is impossible to mix fire and water.

These are only some of the signs of our times.

In your work you must run across many others that stand as obstacles to the performance of the high task that is yours.

But these obstacles, as many and as diversified as they might be, should only serve as added encouragement to push you forward with renewed energy.

I have long thought that those engaged in work such as yours could well adopt the classic saying of St. Augustine which concludes his writings on the subject of Christian combat.

He said, "The crown of victory shall go only to those who engage in the struggle."

In every sense of the word, you are engaged in the struggle to preserve the dignity of man and the decencies which make life worth living.

It is my hope and prayer that you will win that blessed crown, if not in this world, in the hereafter when all of us must give an accounting for our stewardship here on earth.

Twenty Years of Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose a speech made by me on the agricultural situation over the past 20 years. The speech is as follows:

This is the 20th anniversary of a project that has been of tremendous value to the American people. It had its beginning in the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana—the district I have the honor to represent.

Twenty years ago a demonstration project was established on the Brushey and Cooley Creeks watersheds near Minden, in Webster Parish, La. With alternating enthusiasm and doubt, a group of men set out to test the visions and dreams of a man who had for a long time been "crying in the wilderness" in a vain attempt to warn the people of America against the devastating effects of soil erosion.

The Soil Erosion Service was created by Executive order in the Department of the Interior in 1933 to demonstrate on a farm-wide, watershed basis that by application of all known practical conservation measures something could be done to stop this enemy of our national economy.

That demonstration was a tremendous success. It proved that erosion can be controlled through practices that are of immediate benefit to the landowners. It also proved that most erosion control practices can be applied by landowners using the equipment, power, and labor available on the farms being treated.

It is with great pride that I mention the fact that my native State passed the first Soil Conservation District Act which made it possible for farmers to organize soil conservation districts to conserve and improve land resources. Since that date most of the States have passed similar laws and today the soil conservation district movement is national in scope.

It is well to remember that early settlers in this country had no problems of erosion for the reason that under virgin conditions the surface soil was protected and held in place by grasses, trees, and other vegetation. This topsoil was filled with spongy organic matter, holding rainwater until it could soak into the ground to replenish subterranean aquifers, thereby maintaining high underground water level and rendering no damage to the land surface by rushing down the slopes to overflow the streams.

It has been charged that farmers invited soil erosion by their unsound land use. I have heard this denied by men and women who closely observed conditions during the latter part of the last century. They vehemently claim that soil erosion was unheard of until after commercial sawmills denuded the forests and destroyed the source of the spongy material that once covered the surface of the earth and held the rainfall.

Whoever may be guilty of the crime, unmistakably the corpus delicti lies before us. Unfortunately we cannot bury it; we are forced to live with it.

It is estimated that the annual cost of erosion in the United States, in wasted soil and reduction of crop yields, amounts to approximately \$4 billion.

Surveys made in Louisiana by the Soil Conservation Service show that erosion has removed all of the topsoil from more than 170,000 acres; that 200,000 acres have lost 80 percent of the topsoil; and that 60 percent of the topsoil is gone from 1,400,000 acres.

It is scarcely necessary to remind you that we depend on topsoil for our production of food, clothing, and much of our shelter. Most of the soluble nutrients available to growing plants are found in the topsoil. The loss of any portion of it reduces the ability of fields to produce, for the reason that it contains a high percentage of organic matter.

Referring specifically to my native State, we suffer additional damage from unchecked soil erosion in States north of us. Floodwaters which rush down upon us come from watersheds that are mostly barren of forests or cover of any sort. Unchecked on eroded uplands, water builds up in Louisiana's stream channels, clogging them with sediment and debris to result in destruction of food and cover for wildlife. For many years commercial fishing played an important part in our State's economy. But soil erosion in Louisiana and in northward neighboring States has produced silt-laden waters which are detrimental to the propagation of fish.

However, I am happy to report that great progress is being made in Louisiana toward protection of soil and restoration of its fertility. Conservation surveys there have determined the proper land-use capabilities. They show that we have four kinds of land from the standpoint of proper use, namely, lands suitable for continuous cultivation, lands suitable for limited or occasional cultivation, lands suitable only for the growing of grass or trees, and lands suitable only for fish, wildlife, or recreation.

Four years ago the western gulf region of the Soil Conservation Service sounded this warning:

"Soil erosion is one of the biggest tasks Louisiana ever had. Planning the necessary conservation practices and fitting them to the land according to its capabilities and needs were an enormous undertaking. It required millions of man-days of skilled and unskilled labor, technical assistance, and work with heavy and light equipment to accomplish the task. If Louisiana had been afraid to tackle a big job and see it through to completion, the situation would have been hopeless."

It is pleasing to be assured that while the task has not, as yet, been completed, the situation is far from hopeless.

For several years I have been gravely concerned about our water-use, or more specifically stated, I have been apprehensive of our lack of serious planning for future water-use. If, in the future, we are as indifferent toward water-use as the two preceding generations were of forestry-use and land-use, the next immediate generation is going to find itself in a precarious situation. Our streams are polluted and our

ground-water level is becoming distressingly low. A friend of mine relates that he sat at his desk and from memory listed 50 bubbling springs of pure and potent water that were bold and inviting to him as a young man 40 years ago, not 1 of which is visible today. I am told in my district that many shallow wells which were once generous in their production of pure water, are today either bone-dry or polluted beyond safe usage.

What has caused this distressing change? It all goes back to improper use of our once bounteous timbered areas. When we denuded the forests we invited soil erosion which is the proximate cause of our present diminution of surface and underground water supply. We left nothing on the land to hold the rainwater or sponge it long enough for it to seep into the soil and into the fresh-water aquifers that were once so bountiful and dependable. In regard to our water supply, the future is rather dismal.

However, it is gratifying to learn that the Soil Conservation Service is including proper water use in its plans for the future, realizing that if we are to conserve our soil and protect our sources of water supply, we have got to grow trees or vegetation of some sort on every acre of land that we do not need for intensive cultivation.

I do not agree with the statement of the disgruntled old gentleman who acquired from his neighbors the nickname "Pessimistic Pete." When the overflow came and destroyed his cotton crop, Pessimistic Pete whined mournfully, "All nature is against man." And the following year when drought and heat burned his corn crop he gave tongue to the same plaint, "All nature is against man."

It seems to me the reverse of that statement is more nearly the truth. Hasn't man been against all nature? At any rate, the fact remains that whether the farmers or the commercial sawmills invited soil erosion and coincidental water troubles, it behooves man of this generation to rectify those mistakes.

In that portion of Louisiana which I have the privilege of representing in Congress, the two oldest subdivisions of service are known as the Saline Soil Conservation District and the Dorchest Soil Conservation District. The recent annual reports from these two districts reflect considerable progress. The Dorchest reports disclose that, "During the past year, 2,891 acres were given improved woodland management practices and 1,686 acres were selectively cut. Pine seedlings were planted on more than 1,100 unproductive acres." These reports enumerate the progress that is being made in soil conservation practices, under such headings as, "Planning and Application of Conservation Practices," but the general subject is too broad for discussion at this time.

We ordinarily think of soil conservation as a means of restoring fertility to land in order that we may grow more crops. But I am more definitely concerned with what conservation practices will do for future generations in order that those who follow this generation will not condemn us too bitterly for spoiling that which we only had a right to use with care and skill.

The recent report from the Saline district shows:

"Plans are made to apply woodland management to 11,096 acres of woodland on lands of our new cooperators. The district as a whole actually applied woodland management to 7,833 acres."

In order to give you a picture of what the Soil Conservation Service is doing, please consider for a moment the results of that agency's mismanagement of two tracts of land in my district that were acquired by the Federal Government during the depression. This land was classified as submarginal, that is to say, it was considered worthless for row

crops. There are 12,624 acres in the project near Minden and 18,533 acres near Homer.

Last year those 2 projects, under management of the Louisiana Division of the Soil Conservation Service, brought in a revenue of \$153,678 from forest products, grazing permits and concession fees. In lieu of taxes which would be paid to the parish if the land were privately owned, the project pays each year a percentage of its earnings. Last year Claiborne Parish received \$1.36 per acre and Webster Parish got \$1.03 per acre, whereas comparable nearby land, privately owned, paid a tax of 21 cents per acre in Webster and 16 cents per acre in Claiborne.

One other figure concerning these two projects and I will leave with you conclusive proof that we can afford to cover every slope and hillside in the entire South with growing pines and at the same time be helping nature recover her balance and again to function in a manner that will assure us of productive soil and a bountiful water supply.

Under 5 years of management by the Louisiana Soil Conservation Service, those 2 tracts of submarginal land have produced, chiefly from trees, a total revenue of \$616,571. And that timber is increasing in production as the years pass on and the land on which it grows is regaining its fertility. The cost of this management has been nominal. Mother Nature has been the boss and the conservation boys have listened attentively to her.

To January 1, 1953, 6 soil conservation districts have been organized within the area that I represent, consisting of a total of 6,626,900 acres and representing 31,461 farms. There is much of which I could boast concerning the achievements of the soil conservation as applied in the fourth Louisiana congressional district. I would like to point out to you the democratic manner in which districts are formed and operated and how the farmers themselves take the initiative and assume the obligations. There is much to say about the practices as applied to contour farming, strip cropping, terraces, cover cropping, et cetera, but I am restricting my discussion to those practices of soil erosion which more directly concern the future water use and resources.

Our land and water resources are the very foundation of our fabulous industrial and agricultural strength. They are the principal source of our wealth. Our great cities, with all their complex activities, are dependent directly on these resources. Ours is the highest standard of living on earth and it has been built largely on the abundance and fruitfulness of our land and water.

You may think it strange that I am apprehensive of our general neglect of water resources, particularly since Louisiana has an annual rainfall of upwards of 50 inches. Millions of acre-inches of water pass daily down our bayous and rivers, and yet I rejoice to find in the last annual report of activities in the fourth congressional district such items as:

	Acres
Pasture Improvement	393,035
Seeding of pastures	245,961
Woodland management	255,421
Tree planting	41,030

Such items reassure me that some day in the future we will have trees growing on every acre of land that is not needed for intensive cultivation of crops. Trees covering our slopes and hillsides mean better soil and more abundance of pure water.

Time does not permit me to pay deserved tribute to the Agricultural Extension Department and the Louisiana Forestry Commission in their efforts to augment the general plan of growing forests for the protection of soil and the prevention of a future water famine.

Such a project does not entail the expenditure of a large sum of money. Protection

from fire is the most expensive item in the program, which means that someone must be assigned the task of protecting nature against the carelessness and indifference of man.

Let's give nature a chance to restore the balance which we have so ruthlessly disturbed.

However, in fairness to "Pessimistic Pete" let me admit that the schedule a farmer must follow is not fixed by himself. It is largely determined by the weather and other conditions that are beyond his control. When the farmer plows, seeds his acres, or harvests his crops, he is forced to operate in accordance with the whims and vagaries of nature.

Farmers are no longer independent of other phases of economy. There was a time when young men chose to be farmers because that life assured them of almost perfect aloofness from all other activities. They could act independently of the towns and cities. But this is no longer true. Farming has become a part of the fabric of our total economy. Tractors, motor trucks, combines, hay balers, and other mechanical equipment are necessary and make farmers dependent upon the factories who have built for them 4 million tractors, 4 million automobiles, and 2 million trucks, all of which use fuel and lubricating oil that help force farmers into the lifeline of trade and make them dependent upon many industrial enterprises.

Mechanizing the farm has not only brought the farmer into closer contact with industry, but it has changed his manner and standard of living. And it has also reduced his ranks, that is numerically.

Total agricultural production of the United States was harvested in 1952 with a half-million fewer workers than were used in 1950. Yet the harvest was approximately equal to the high records reached in 1948 and 1949. In other words, a half million fewer workers were needed in 1952 to harvest bigger production than was had 2 years previously.

The use of mechanical devices and the utilization of gasoline and electric power have combined to change the economic status of the farm family. The availability of electric power has done more to raise the living standard of rural people than any other innovation within my memory. Of the approximately 5 million farms in the United States, nearly half of them now depend upon electric power.

Who made this power available to rural people?

The Rural Electrification Administration was established by Executive order on May 11, 1935. The following year an act of Congress was passed which gave REA permanent status and authorized a 10-year lending program. In 1944 this authority was extended indefinitely, leaving to Congress the authority to determine each year the amount of funds REA may lend.

The basic policy of REA is to render "certain technical advice and assistance to its borrowers * * * and to assist rural people in doing things which they cannot do for themselves." The plan of the REA is democracy at its best. It provides credit for rural families who want to help themselves and furnishes technical guidance when needed. "Each borrower is an entirely independent corporate body, locally owned and controlled, and existing pursuant to applicable State laws, and each such borrower is itself responsible for the management of its own affairs, proper and successful construction and operation of its own system, and the repayment of the REA loan."

REA itself operates no rural-electric facilities, and its program involves no grants or subsidies. Its loans are paid out of the operating revenues of the locally owned and locally managed co-op organization.

The rural people of Louisiana have availed themselves of the opportunities offered by the REA. As of June 8, 1953, there are in that comparatively small land-area State 12,812 subscribers represented by 10 co-op organizations that have borrowed a total of \$4,610,000 with which to construct many miles of powerlines.

These powerlines are a network of security. They relieve the mind and the body of many vexing and fatiguing problems and tasks. They pump water and keep it flowing through the home; they cook food, wash clothes and dishes; they milk cows and supply lights to the home and the barn; they provide communications with the doctor, with neighbors, and markets. Those lines are there because rural people put them there through their own initiative and labor, with assistance from an enlightened Government.

In October of 1949 the REA was authorized to make loans to local telephone co-ops for the purpose of constructing and operating telephone facilities. At an interest rate of 2 percent, loans totaling \$106 million have been approved for borrowers from the different States of the Union.

It is important to note that commercial utilities companies supplied, last year, about 54 percent of the power used by rural consumers. However, in addition to the power purchased during the fiscal year 1952, REA borrowers used 649 million kilowatt-hours generated in their own plants.

Science has spread to the farms and the intelligent use of it has brought about many changes during the past century. Perhaps the rural family is again taking a prominent place in the social, political, and economic life of the Nation.

When this country was young, the farmer—particularly the planter of the South—enjoyed the highest standards of living American society had experienced. The Civil War, followed by discriminating legislation, such as differential freight rates and high tariff on manufactured imports, completely reversed the situation and the rural agricultural South became, in the words of the late President Roosevelt, "the Nations No. 1 economic problem."

Through such subsidies a vast discrepancy developed between prices the farmer had to pay for what he bought and the prices obtained for what he produced, and out of this unbalanced economy there emerged legislation that sought to remedy the situation. Agriculture had at last become a basic industry, closely meshed into our complex system of economy. Industry, labor, and agriculture became dependent one upon the other. Farmers demanded and deserved full-parity prices for farm products and parity income for farm people. It is true that this objective cannot be obtained by Government programs alone, nevertheless, the farmer needs some protection against changing international relationships which quickly affect prices of farm products, over which he has no control.

Earlier in this talk I called attention to the fact that the schedule a farmer must follow is not fixed by himself. It is largely determined by the weather and other conditions that are beyond his control. When the farmer plows, seeds his acres, or harvests his crops, he is forced to operate in accordance with the whims and vagaries of nature.

Everyone who is interested in agriculture or who speaks or writes about farm families and rural people should make some effort to comprehend the word "parity." I particularly commend to certain city newspaper columnists the following definition of the very much misunderstood word:

"The parity of an agricultural commodity, generally speaking, is the price which will give the commodity the same purchasing power as it had during a given base period in terms of (1) prices of commodities farmers buy, (2) interest on mortgage indebtedness, (3) taxes on farm real estate, and (4) for

most commodities, wage rates for hired farm labor.

"The parity price of an individual farm commodity, in other words, is a standard for measuring the purchasing power of that commodity in relation to prices of goods and services during a definite base period."

Through the influence and direction of the USDA the southern farmer has been getting away from the so-called one-crop system and turning much of his acreage into pastures. As a consequence, the dairying and beef cattle industries have expanded while cotton production has decreased. During this same period of time cotton production has increased in some of the far-Western States. Sufficient time has not elapsed to determine that the South should sacrifice her traditional superiority in cotton culture in favor of animal husbandry, nor have those Western States had ample time to assure them that they should plow up their pastures and plant them in cotton. For better or for worse, the South has been for more than a century and a half the throne of Old King Cotton. And the prevailing economy of 150 years cannot be shifted abruptly without deplorable consequences.

There are many phases of agriculture which I would like to discuss, such as reciprocal trade agreements, trade expansion with foreign countries, foreign agricultural service and technical assistance, all of which are important factors in our national economy and of particular interest to rural people. However, I must acknowledge that no one could completely cover, in less than a book-length treatise, all the "Problems and Progress in Agriculture."

Even so, I consider it a duty, as well as a privilege, to express my high regard for work done by the Animal Husbandry Division of the Bureau of Animal Industry. I am amazed at the network service provided farmers by these divisions of the USDA, reaching down through their affiliates to the State livestock sanitary boards. May I cite only one example of accomplishment?

Five years ago that dreaded animal plague known as foot-and-mouth disease had spread over an area of nearly 260,000 square miles. Farmers in my section were alarmed. In fact, there was danger to the cattle of the entire Nation. To wipe out this scourge, it was necessary to kill almost a million cattle, sheep, hogs, and goats. Vaccination was administered to more than 60 million animals. These agricultural agencies of the United States were forced to spend about \$123 million to carry out our part of the program in conjunction with Mexico, but that money was spent wisely and effectively.

We hear some growling about the tremendous sums that the National and State Governments spend on agriculture. But we haven't seen that man, woman, or child who wants to stop eating, wearing clothes, living in houses, and covering their feet with shoes. We haven't talked to a single historian who refused to admit that we won two world wars largely because we outproduced the enemy, nor have we talked to one who refuses to admit that our ability to grow food and clothing and to produce materials of war is our greatest deterrent against attack by the Communists. We haven't seen that person who isn't grateful to farmers for what they did during the last World War. Remember, farmers were called upon to do the impossible. And they did. They actually produced four times the amount of commodities called upon to produce.

But with our rapidly increasing population, how far away is that fatal day when our soil can no longer produce enough food, clothing, shelter, and water to sustain the people? How long before we reach the saturation point? Will it be a century from now, or will it be 80 years, or only 50 years from now?

Shouldn't we of this generation open our eyes and watch the jaws of the stupendous pincers steadily closing? Those jaws are someday going to squeeze the very life out of us if we don't begin right now making plans to avoid that catastrophe.

Shouldn't we open our eyes and see the terrible threat to our economic safety that is so evident in the rapid increase of population and so obvious in our diminution of water and land resources?

What countries are always the source of unrest? The pages of history unmistakably answer that question. Wars are started by and in those nations where populations have grown beyond the ability of land and water resources adequately to sustain them.

Where is communism flourishing today? In what lands has that evil doctrine taken root? The answer is:

In those parts of Asia and Europe where 1 acre of land is required to support 80 people. That's the answer, fellow Americans.

With our natural increase in population, plus our far too liberal laws that haphazardly govern immigration, how many years before every acre of our soil will be called upon to furnish 80 people with food, water, clothing, and shelter?

And yet there is demand from some quarters that we increase the immigration quotas during the next 2 years by admitting an additional thousands of Europeans. This demand is supported largely by tear-jerking stories.

The people of my district are sick and tired of tax burdens for the purpose of supplying peoples of foreign countries who thank us by a kick in the teeth. The people of my district don't want those huge quotas of aliens here to hasten the fatal day when our soil may no longer be able to sustain the population. Why should we be continually called upon to give, give, give and keep on giving to sustain some of them at home and at the same time called upon to bring great numbers of them to the United States to hasten the day when our land can no longer sustain the people?

In my opinion, immigration agreements with each country should be on an exchange basis, reciprocal in number. Example: We accept a thousand people from Shang-ri-la if there are a thousand Americans who want to go to Shang-ri-la.

I shed no tears with those who misinterpret Cain's question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" Abel had disappeared under suspicious circumstances and when Cain was asked, "Where is Abel thy brother?" the killer replied, "I know not: Am I my brother's keeper?"

And the murderer's sentence was pronounced in these words, "When thou tillest the ground, it shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength; a fugitive and vagabond shalt thou be in the earth."

I don't find in this Biblical story any suggestion that we Americans should be classed as murderers among nations. I see no suggestion that we should run the risk of destroying our economy in order that we sustain peoples of the world in their own kitchens until they decide they'd fare better by coming to ours. It is shameful to distort the meaning of Biblical phrases in order to play upon human emotions.

These grave problems, which I have stated very simply, are being seriously pondered by the cotton farmers along the fertile Red River Delta and by the dairymen and cattlemen of the same area, as well as by the hill farmers who are wisely turning most of their land into the growing of grass and trees.

The fathers and grandfathers of these hill farmers were accused of the crime of depleting the soil by unsound farming. They were charged with inviting erosion. I seriously doubt their guilt. I think their only offense against the general economy was the selling of their timber for a mere pittance of what

it was worth. It may not be unjust to accuse them of being accessories to the fact, because they permitted their slopes and hillsides to become denuded and made barren of trees.

This being the 20th anniversary of the soil-saving demonstration that was begun in the 4th Congressional District of Louisiana, I ask for the privilege of congratulating those people and saying to them that if it is true that each generation merely has the right of trusteeship over our natural resources, then they, the farmers, have demonstrated beyond peradventure that the precious treasures of this country are in trustworthy hands.

Address of Senator Wallace F. Bennett of Utah, at Memorial Day Services, Jefferson Barracks National Cemetery, St. Louis, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the excellent and most appropriate remarks made by Senator Wallace F. Bennett, of Utah, at the Memorial Day services held at Jefferson Barracks National Cemetery, in St. Louis, Mo.:

We are met here today—in this place of peace and beauty—to spend a brief hour in contemplation of the meaning and purpose of our great country and the parts these men have played and we must play in its destiny.

As I sought to prepare myself to participate on this occasion, my mind went back to the Saviour's profoundly beautiful parable of the talents; and there I found a focus for my thoughts.

To us Americans—as to the servants in the parable—has been given a great treasure: all that can be embraced in the word "America."

Our country is more than the geographic area which we inhabit or the material possessions we enjoy. From the beginning, it has been to its patriotic citizens the symbol of their greatest spiritual resources—the promise of their dreams for happiness—the reward for their devotion.

Our country has never been just another piece of land to those who came to its shores out of an older world. To some it was a refuge, to others a challenge. To all, it has ever been a promise of freedom. And this concept of freedom—spiritual before it became manifest in the form and function of government—is the greatest treasure that we have, and makes us the richest nation in the world. In the symbolism of the parable, we are the servants to whom the five talents were given.

Up to date, on the whole, we have used this treasure well. In the beginning it was little more than a dream, but in 300 years we have given it great substance. In the parable, the worthy servant doubled his talents. Ours have been multiplied almost to infinity. Inspired by it, each generation has made its own sacrifices for the future, so that our blessings have grown faster than our population, and there is more for each of us among the millions than there was to be divided among the first few. Certainly, because our fathers were faithful over a few things, we have been made rulers over many.

But the parable is never a completed story. It is a new challenge to every new American in every new generation; and before we can earn the plaudit of "Well done, thou good and faithful servant," we must, in turn, make our own contribution to the growth of this great treasure.

To do so effectively, we must first learn for ourselves its true significance. If we lose sight of its spiritual foundation, if we fail to comprehend the irreplaceable part that freedom has played in its accumulation, we cannot use it wisely. Unless we realize that our material abundance is the product of our spiritual strength, we are in danger of losing it all—like the slothful servant. If we measure America only in terms of the number of gadgets per capita—and preen and boast of these—our current contest with the Soviets becomes no more than materialistic marauding.

For, because it is a great treasure, it attracts and inflames the evil motives of evil men. Being without understanding of its spiritual significance, they seek to seize its material values which, in their hands, would turn to dust and despair—as it will in ours, if we lose our understanding.

So, how do we best make use of this great treasure that has been entrusted to our care?

The first and obvious truth we draw from the lesson of the parable is that in a world that so desperately needs help to build a similar treasure, we cannot save it only for ourselves by burying it in isolation. We must protect it, of course, against all enemies of peace and freedom; but to keep it vital, we must share its blessings and expand its power, both in our own country and in all the world. As a nation, this need should ever guide our fundamental policies at home and abroad. At home, we work to keep the light of liberty alive—abroad, to share its blessings and thus justify our stewardship as good and faithful servants.

In the spirit of this concept, President Eisenhower is completely right when he reiterates as our continuing objective the ultimate freedom of the enslaved nations.

He is profoundly wise when he works patiently for peace, because only in an atmosphere of peace can the blessings of liberty expand to full flower.

But he must also be prudent and alert to the danger of attack and the need for adequate defense. Peace and war are always literally hanging in the balance; and the skillful blending of plans for peace—with postures for defense—without letting either overturn the other is a task requiring almost superhuman judgment and infinite patience and devotion.

He has demonstrated his broad grasp of the scope of the problem and his ability to adjust to meet the changing challenge of the evil enemy by his proposals to broaden the effectiveness of NATO beyond its present limited military emphasis and breathe into the alliance the spirit of community in the spiritual values of liberty. This is a classic example of one means by which we can put our American talent to use and thus expand its value to the world.

Another great demonstration of adaptability has been our more effective use of the U. N. Since Eisenhower became President, we have ceased our previous passive policy by which we expected U. N., by itself, to solve all international problems and have used it affirmatively as an instrument to expand our influence for peace—a forum to explain and sell our basic concepts to the world—a channel through which our contributions could be made.

And in his recent appointment of Senator George to serve America abroad, he provides a living reminder to the world that Americans of both political parties stand and serve together in its great mission to build this great treasure by sharing it with all men everywhere.

Perhaps by this time you are asking yourselves, "Why talk about this problem here, in this place that has been hallowed by the presences of these men who gave their lives in war and on this day on which we honor them?" I know of no place more fitting and of no day more appropriate. It was in the furtherance of this great responsibility that these men gave their lives.

The concept of freedom is always in peril. Since the beginning of recorded history, most men have lived in virtual slavery, under the shadow of tyranny, and few men have been free. Our own American experience has been the longest and strongest flowering of freedom. But its perpetuation will never be assumed. The lust for power will never disappear. And we must always be prepared to defend and preserve it, by war if necessary.

And yet in a way, this is a wise part of God's purpose, because without opposition there can be no growth—without challenge, no inspiration to overcome. If there were no new areas in need of liberty, we might be tempted to "bury" liberty like slothful servants, and thus lose it.

As long as the evil challenges the good, it will seek to resort to its obvious weapon, force; and men will be called to use force in liberty's defense. Of these, some will die as these have done, making their life's contribution in one sacrifice. Their task has been to preserve for the rest of us the opportunity to build. They died to keep the door open and the hope alive. Theirs is a necessary and honored part in the process of peace.

Their sacrifice deepens our obligation to use the opportunity they preserved with greater effectiveness and more devoted zeal—to keep the light of liberty bright and make its blessings more abundant here in America so that all men can draw inspiration from this source and, working together, we can spread both light and blessings ever farther in a groping, starving world.

Spiritual Values in a World of Crises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 28, 1956, it was my privilege to deliver the commencement address at the 56th annual commencement exercises of Westmar College, Le Mars, Iowa, at which time I was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of laws. My address follows:

We live in a time of desperate challenge. Great problems confront us.

Your generation will be called upon to assume responsibilities of vast magnitude. You will be called upon to assume the burden of a world torn by two conflicting ideologies.

One preaches the Word of God, sustained and strengthened by faith in the divine teachings of the Holy Bible.

The other plots in darkness to enslave mankind under a cruel tyranny that denies God and would tear down all that we hold sacred.

One believes in freedom under God as the source of all human progress. That philosophy, to which we adhere, upholds the dignity and sanctity of the individual. The other would destroy all freedom and all religion except worship of the state. In the Communist philosophy the individual exists only to serve the purposes of the government.

Within the lifetime of all of us here today revolutionary changes have taken place.

The swift pace of modern scientific development has touched upon every aspect of human activity. The old concepts of time and space have been swept away. Research into the secrets of nature has made possible the destruction of civilization should the world become involved in total war.

I bring these grim facts to your attention only to emphasize my firm belief that the future of mankind depends upon a clear understanding of the eternal and unchanging truths that govern the destinies of men and nations.

I wonder if you will agree with me then that the human race is living today close to the edge of eternity and that this unprecedented fact in history calls for a reappraisal, so to speak, of the future of the world.

I wonder if you will agree with me that had we been living in a more normal period of history—before the nuclear age—we would, as the result of the natural forces of international attrition, be deeply involved at this hour in World War III.

Now what I want to be concerned with here today in my meditations with you is a determination—just among ourselves—on just what it is in civilization that endures. Our problem is to decide where to put the major accent on life and how to shape our world in the immediate hours ahead so that we shall not blow ourselves and all of life on this planet into a mass of nuclear gases.

This we know: There is no comparable period in human history during which so much has happened to so many people in so fractional a space of historic time.

We want to know first how we can go on living as the human race. And then we want to know how we can go on living without being enslaved.

I begin with a premise.

My premise is this:

My premise is that the United States of America is up to this hour the greatest triumph of Christianity.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower in an address in 1955 made this statement: "As we build a richer material world, we must always remember that there are spiritual truths which endure forever. They are the universal inspiration of all mankind." George Washington in his farewell address more than 150 years ago uttered these words: "Religion and morality lead to political prosperity." These great men, though living many decades apart, shared the belief that a sound prosperity cannot be accomplished without a foundation of high standards of spiritual and moral principles and values.

My premise is that the moral values are the enduring values.

My premise is that victory in the struggle we are now in is so deeply involved in moral values that we cannot hope to survive without them. We shall need and maintain our strength-in-being, our Gideon's sword, but, I insist, we shall get nowhere without the Ark of the Covenant.

Now when I say that the United States is the greatest moral and practical triumph of Christianity I am not to be misconstrued into believing that I think we Americans are (a) the chosen people, or (b) the master race.

I am not putting out that kind of boast.

On the contrary, I hold it the most vital long-term duty—a duty of the greatest magnitude—that the whole world, under whatever religion, feel at the heart of its peoples and the seat of its governments, the power of the moral principles that make for survival of mankind and amity among the nations of the earth. It is up to the United States to be among the nations what Paul of Tarsus was among men.

Now when I say we here represent the greatest triumph of Christianity, I mean by triumph of moral principle over that which is bad. Our Constitution says that "all men are created equal." It is a cornerstone in

our sense of moral values. The question is: So you believe all men are created equal? So what? Here is the difference: The Americans spelled that phrase out into statutory law. They spelled it out in their Constitution. They amended their Constitution to spell it out even more. And they are rendering decisions in their highest courts not only to keep the Constitution, under which they established Christianity in Government alike, but to expand and enrich it.

When you do these things you then give yourself the right, by virtue of your conduct, to preach; you give yourself the obligation to teach, perhaps to boast.

The Bible came out of the steaming ferments of the Middle East in antiquity. But in 2,000 years I do not know where its credo has been applied more practically than in the Congress of the United States, the White House, and the Supreme Court. For that matter we did not invent the internal combustion engine. But when we got hold of it we made the automobile the greatest industry of all time. It is this business of plucking a great ideal out of the dreams of the visionaries, and the schemes out of the half-realized hopes of the great inventors—foreign and native—and putting them to work for the good of all men that explains so much of America's success.

The moral ethics we live by came from Christ, they came from Moses, they came from Aristotle, and others. But before we got through we had: trial by jury, habeas corpus, due process, no unusual punishments, equal justice under law, and a sublimely organized system of courts for the protection—precisely for the protection—of the dignity of man.

By triumph of Christianity, I mean we took the blueprints of Christianity and law and created working tools.

That has built us up to the present hour but it does not protect us for the future.

We began this Nation with 3 million agrarian citizens and a sort of gross national income in 1799 of \$687 million—substantially less than \$1 billion. Our gross national product is now approaching—as President Eisenhower pointed out in his state of the Union message recently—\$400 billion.

From less than one billion, in rough economic language, to upward of \$400 billion in something over 150 years. What made possible this fabulous progress?

There have been other great land masses with enormous resources.

Why did they not blossom with a parallel prosperity?

I venture a few broad-gaged guesses:

They gave priority and privilege to some one church instead of giving the fullest opportunity to all, as on this soil—and priority to none.

They failed to separate church from state and they totalitarianized the one and persecuted the other.

They preferred aristocracy and privilege to democracy and equal opportunity.

They perpetuated corruption and accelerated decay because they lacked the purgative powers and the self-criticism of a free press.

Their system of popular education was so debased by despotism or semi-despotism that teaching a nation to read and write made the people only more vulnerable to a form of totalitarian propaganda and yellow journalism, and the victims of deliberately designed falsifications.

They failed because they ignored the moral and spiritual values that alone give strength to a nation's roots, its foundations, its reason for being.

The system that grew up here was imbedded in the public school, the town meeting, and the free press. We implemented democracy and justice in government by providing a government by consent of the

governed. When we talked about "all men . . . created equal" we worried, as Lincoln did at Gettysburg, about giving it meaning in everyday life. When we Americans say, "love thy neighbor as thyself," we are not just reading Leviticus in the Old Testament and Mark in the New and letting it go at that. If someone invents a steam engine, we Americans expect it to run a locomotive. We expect it to replace sails on the sea, to carry freight, to move passengers, to build an economy. When we thunder at the greatest power of the time that all men "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights," we Americans are not kidding because we expect to get those rights, fight for them and, if necessary, die in the process. All of which is precisely and exactly and extravagantly just what we do.

And we do it again and again and again. "Love thy neighbor as thyself" did not mean for us sharing cookies with the family across the street on some one day during the Christmas season. It meant that Cuba was to be free. It meant that the Philippines were to have their independence, just as we had our independence. It meant that any little people anywhere on this earth could lift its melancholy face towards Washington, D. C., and hear ringing out to the oppressed peoples the electric language of the "self-determination of nations" in the ennobling words of Woodrow Wilson and his successors.

It meant relations with our neighbors, Mexico and Canada, founded on persuasion and consent. It meant a climax of thinking across the frontiers that rendered senseless and unthinkable any policy of violence, of infiltration, or conquest. It meant a relationship founded on mutual respect, not mutual fear, and it produced hemisphere understanding and vast regional solidarity and strength on the side of the free world.

That's what it meant.

And it meant that for the free world—after the United States had spoken and practiced its words—the existence of satellite nations would stand out as a symbol of shame, of national peonage, and that it would be an affront to the whole world's sense of freedom and right in the era that is our era.

Yet we are but seven percent of the population of the world.

After 157 years, this tiny confederation of 13 States emerges as the greatest power of all time. It is the unexampled phenomenon of 166 million people governed by 166 million people. It is so much the very heartbeat of world liberty that monarchs and statesmen, kings and queens, those in power and those in exile—but all seeking liberty or strength for liberty—come to the podium in the House of Representatives in the Capitol of the United States of America to plead their cause. The satellites that come to Moscow look glumly for their orders. The nations that appeal to us for whatever influence we have to give to enable them to continue free and independent.

As clearly as black is black and white is white, Washington means freedom and Moscow means enslavement.

We have then to ask ourselves: Now what?

If you agree with me that we have the moral might—in the interests not alone of our own preservation but in the interests of the preservation of the free world and life itself on this planet to right a wrong, then our problem is: What processes shall we employ? What methods shall we use, what tools, what means? And, can we do this at all without going to the brink and without precipitating the very World War III we are so bent upon preventing?

The answer is that, in one form or another, it all happened before—and in our time. The answer is that of course no people grimly determined to maintain its integrity against enslavement or destruction can hope to survive against a resolute and a dangerous

enemy without some element of risk. But I insist that the risk can be buttressed by character, courage, and strength. And with these I feel—as history I am about to relate proves—that communism has been and can be stopped dead in its tracks. I believe we are doing this under our administration today and I believe, moreover, that in this contest between freedom and communism there are no party lines.

Of course, given the brute strength of a limitless army, given conditions of desperate poverty, given widespread chaos, and the Soviet Union, or its fatal export, communism, can and does expand. But unless everything we know about conquest by force as against conquest by moral principle is wrong, it will be impossible to convince me that communism has even begun to take root among the third of the earth's population and the fourth of the world's surface where it now rules.

It is only just now giving itself its own blow to its own solar plexus.

We now have the proof in the Kremlin's own words that communism in general and the Soviet Union's oligarchy do not respect each other or themselves.

It is because they are vulnerable on moral grounds that they are vulnerable on every other ground—economic, political, diplomatic, ideological.

We all remember Austria, France, and Italy in 1947. They were becoming Communist-ridden. Their governments were tottering under the vast despair of postwar chaos. Exercising our high moral standards we stopped, on the home soil of the other man's country—the tragic overwhelming of free government by Communist infiltration. We stopped subversion and the misuse of a people's poverty to destroy their liberty.

In our overall program, Western Germany was brought into the anti-Communist fold. It happened that total success was not to be our lot. For while we succeeded brilliantly for the most part in Europe, we underwent dismal failure for the most part in the Far East. We have to accept the conditions of combat—for wars are like that.

I could go on and relate the story of Iran, which but for us might have been swallowed by the Soviet Union.

I could go on and tell the story of Greece and Turkey with the Kremlin breathing on their necks.

I could go on and report the heroic tale of the Berlin airlift.

What I say in sum is that the Communist ideology is not an irresistible force. The Soviet Union, with its Kremlin, is anything but an immovable body.

But moral force is both.

No one with an open mind and a clear view will belittle the compelling impact of President Eisenhower's challenge to the Soviet Union on disarmament and aerial inspection at the Geneva "meeting at the summit." Who can miss the sheer power of the confidence President Eisenhower enjoys from the people of his own country and the world in relation to this contest with communism?

What I urge today is that we seek with all the diligence we have, with all the wisdom we can get to lead us, with all the sincerity of our own people, some formula tailored—in each case—to the prevailing situation, for the defeat of the Communist enemy.

One part of this formula must be our own strength in the area of education in our own country.

We may even turn the Soviet tragedy to some benefit if under pressure of its crisis we exert ourselves on the educational plane to meet it head-on. We must defeat the peril of drastic shortages in skilled occupations. We must determine why students drop out of school and how gifted students may develop their abilities. I go all the way with the proposal that opportunities for higher education should be available to all Americans to the extent of their capabilities.

What I have sought to emphasize in this address is the suddenly extended, suddenly accentuated meaning of our moral and spiritual values in the light of atheism's physical and ideological threat from Moscow. We cannot miss the importance in a technological age of the need for higher education and the development of our national talents to their noblest flowering. It is this that will contribute mightily to a strong and progressive America. Above all, this growth, morally and spiritually, this strengthening of our native talents by training and education, is without meaning if it is not based on the bulwarking, equally, of our faith in our constitutional rights. Given these moral and spiritual forces, given this all encompassing education for all our people, given this faith in the American heritage, victory for the free world will be the inevitable reward for mankind.

Nothing you graduates can possibly do will enrich yourselves more or hasten the triumph of faith or make a better contribution to your country than to proclaim and demonstrate the faith and learning you have gathered here at Westmar. May each of you bring something to a world in need of light and understanding.

The Civil Rights Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a speech which I delivered yesterday, Sunday, June 3, at the annual meeting of the Urban League of Greater New York, held at the Williams Institutional CME Church, 131st Street and 7th Avenue, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN AT 45TH ANNUAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING OF THE URBAN LEAGUE OF GREATER NEW YORK, WILLIAMS INSTITUTIONAL CME CHURCH, 131ST STREET AND 7TH AVENUE, JUNE 3, 1956

I take this opportunity to pay my heartfelt tribute to the Urban League which has been working on the problem of intergroup and interracial relations for almost half a century.

Over the years the Urban League has made historic contributions to the solution of many aspects of the civil-rights problem. One of the league's main achievements has been to help expose and define its roots and manifestations, in terms of housing, schools, recreation facilities, and other phases of segregation and integration.

The Urban League has furnished a framework within which men of good will of all races could work together to achieve steady advances toward the goal of adjustment, focusing their efforts on the neighborhood and the community.

This organization has helped to show how vast are the ramifications of intergroup and interracial adjustment, what concrete and specific evils flow from discrimination and segregation, and what must and can be done about it.

Some people, including some of the leaders of our Government, act as though civil rights were a brandnew problem, which has just arisen and needs nothing so much as to be studied. And they indicate that as soon

as they finish studying it, they will probably do something about it. And, of course, that may take a long time.

Others talk as if the civil-rights problem were like a sudden attack of virus and that all that should or can be done is to give the patient plenty of rest, and maybe a dose or two of some patent medicine, like a conference.

You and I know how unrelated to the facts of life these views of the problem are. We know that the problem called civil rights is one of vast complexity, some of whose manifestations will take time to work out, but all of whose aspects need to be worked on, without a moment's needless delay, urgently, deliberately, and zealously.

You and I know, and some of you better than I, how galling and intolerable are the many aspects of injustice, discrimination, and segregation based on race, and how they involve almost every phase of neighborhood, community, and national life.

In basic respects, the civil-rights problem is as much a northern problem as it is southern. Harlem here is a glaring manifestation of the civil-rights problem in the North, and I shall speak more about that in a moment.

But, above all, the civil-rights problem is one which involves each of us and millions like us, in our personal everyday lives, either as victims of discrimination and segregation, or as those who, willing or not, or consciously or not, are the victimizers, the discriminators, or the segregators.

The civil-rights problem is reflected in the house or apartment we live in, in the street or neighborhood we call our own, in the job or profession we work at, in the shops we patronize, in the movie we attend, in the vacation we plan, and in the schools to which we send our children or to which we ourselves go. In short, the civil-rights problem touches us all in the most personal and intimate details of our lives, in one way or another, depending upon the racial, social, and economic group to which we belong.

These aspects constitute the real core of the civil-rights problem. Around this core are gathered the more dramatic manifestations—the legal and political manifestations which furnish the major approaches to the core and substance aspects of it.

In our concentration on these approaches, which are the obvious instruments of our efforts, we must never lose sight of the core and substance, which are the end objects of these efforts.

In recent months the civil-rights problem has sharpened into a national crisis. This crisis dominates our thinking today; it dominates our political life, too, unwilling as some are to recognize that fact.

Just as the possibility of atomic warfare overshadows our foreign policy today, so the possibility of a racial conflict overshadows our domestic policy.

The civil-rights problem is like a volcano, smoking and bubbling, in the full view of the Nation. All eyes are upon it. Endless words are now being spoken and written about it.

But that volcano has been there for a long time. Only a relatively few have paid much concentrated attention to it in the past, or tried to understand the teeming forces within it. Yet we must understand those forces or we will be unable to cope with them, or control their disastrous consequences.

Today, as I have already indicated, too many Americans, including, I fear, many at the highest levels of our political life, do not understand those forces at all, either as to their nature or their magnitude. And in this lack of understanding lies our greatest danger. Without such an understanding we will not be able to meet the crisis or mobilize the efforts needed to solve the deep-laid problems which underlie the crisis.

In my work in the United States Senate on the civil-rights problem, my efforts are

necessarily limited to the tools with which I work. Those tools consist of national legislation and such influence as I can bring to bear, as a Senator, upon the executive branch of the Federal Government. I must further limit my efforts to those undertakings which have either some practical prospect of success, or indicate some possibility of having a constructive effect. None of us can operate on all fronts or move simultaneously in all directions.

At the moment in Washington I am devoting my efforts to the following fronts:

1. Legislation to guarantee to all our citizens the right to participate fully in political activity, in all parts of the country—the right to vote.

2. Legislation to guarantee to all our inhabitants physical security of person, and the equal protection of the law in the enjoyment of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—the right of equal justice under law.

3. Legislation to provide a greater degree of equality of opportunity—in jobs, in education and in access to the major avenues of personal fulfillment and realization—in other words, FEPC, school integration and nondiscrimination in all publicly supported facilities.

4. Legislation to provide a greater measure of social welfare for all underprivileged groups, including minority groups—such as housing and medical care.

5. And, executive action to complete integration in all branches of the Government service, especially in the so-called elite services, such as the Foreign Service.

This is a big order. How much, if any, of this legislation will be enacted at this session of Congress I cannot predict. The prospects are not too bright.

But speaking for myself, alone, I am going to continue to fight for legislation designed to achieve these objectives, and will continue to press the executive branch for action and for leadership, to the full extent of my energies and abilities.

And if we are frustrated in Congress, I am prepared to carry the fight to the Democratic Convention in Chicago in August, and to the people, in the elections in the fall, regardless of whether I am a candidate for reelection or not.

I pledge that I will not spare my own efforts, or withhold any influence which I can exert toward these ends.

A few moments ago I said that the civil-rights problem is a northern as well as a southern one, and that here in Harlem we have both illustration and proof that the acute manifestations of this problem are not confined to the South.

Harlem is a community rich in tradition and culture. Its contributions to the mainstream of national life, politically, socially, economically and culturally have been many and varied. But Harlem is also a rebuke to us of the North, and a challenge to clean up our own backyard, even as we press forward with our efforts to bring justice and equality to the Negroes and other oppressed minorities.

Harlem is a ghetto. Harlem is an area of poverty, congestion, substandard housing and substandard schooling. These conditions rather than the race or national origin of the people who reside in Harlem, are primarily responsible for the high incidence of crime and juvenile delinquency in the area.

We need residential integration in New York City. Housing segregation is responsible for the high incidence of school segregation in our metropolis, the empire city of the Nation. I am afraid that the policies of our New York City planners have not helped the situation.

We have built too many housing projects, not on vacant land, but on congested land. We have cleared some slums only to create new and worse ones. We have constructed

housing projects which were, by their location, forced into a pattern of segregation.

There are substantial elements, including the Urban League, which are working patiently, persistently and strenuously toward the solution of these aspects of the problem, which are as much a part of civil rights as the right to vote and FEPC. Residential segregation is the other side of the coin of school segregation.

One public official who, long before he became a public official, had analyzed this problem, focused on it and agitated consistently for its solution over a period of many years, is my old friend, Charles Abrams, whom Governor Harriman was wise enough to name last year as chairman of the State commission against discrimination.

I want to pay my public tribute to Charles Abrams for his long-time efforts in this field.

I was amazed and, may I say, deeply shocked when Charles Abrams was recently made the object of a political attack by a leading political figure in New York State. Mr. Abrams was accused of being a zealot in the cause of nondiscrimination. Well, if ever there was a cause which called for ceaseless dedication and agitation, this is it.

In this whole struggle I range myself on the side of the Charles Abramses in this, and there are quite a few of them in this country.

I cannot be a neutralist. I cannot stand above the battle.

I identify myself with the victims of oppression and discrimination, wherever and whoever they may be. If that is being a zealot, if dedicated efforts to uphold the law, the Constitution and the laws of New York make one a zealot, well, call me a zealot, too.

We need more and not less of this kind of zealot in the fight for civil rights. Of course, I do not mean that we need more intransigent extremists. I mean men of practical understanding and of patient energy, but also of unlimited dedication and devotion.

Yes, we need more men like Charles Abrams, in New York and in the Nation, and we need less who spend their time trying to understand the viewpoint of those who defy the law or the spirit of the law but who have little concern for the victims of illegal oppression and discrimination.

We need fewer public leaders who utter empty platitudes instead of proposing concrete plans for action.

There are too many in Washington and elsewhere in the North who, when they say "we must sympathize with the problems of the South," really mean—the problems of the southern whites, and particularly the problems of those southern whites who have a stake, political or economic, in the maintenance of segregation and the doctrine of white supremacy.

I think I understand the problems of the South, or at least I try to, but I have little sympathy for those elements of the South that are determined to defy the supreme law of the land and to maintain the practice of segregation for their own comfort, convenience and advantage.

I have genuine sympathy with those in the South who are sincerely working to bring about a change, in an orderly way, and with the least possible dislocation.

But most of all, I have sympathy for those long-suffering individuals—Americans like you and me—who, for all of their lives have endured the whiplash of discrimination and segregation. They are the ones whose plight calls for our first concern. They are the injured, to whom justice must be rendered.

Through the lowering darkness of this present crisis, the light of hope shines true. This is a right cause. Justice is on our side.

We may hope that God is on our side, too. At least, in the words of Abraham Lincoln, we can hope that we are on His side.

We must proceed, and are proceeding, without hate or rancor. Compassion and understanding are written on our banners. But we will not stay our efforts or be stayed. We are the upholders of the law, and we will not be denied.

Immigration or Invasion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address which I delivered at the 66th national congress, Sons of the American Revolution, on Memorial Day, May 30, 1956, at the Sagamore Hotel, Bolton Landing on Lake George, N. Y.

The address follows:

This year—like all election years—brings us that most bipartisan of all political games: The courting of the minorities. It is again played with great fervor by those candidates for elective office who believe that organized minority groups wield enough power to clinch the vote in so-called close districts and States.

There appears to be an irresistible fascination in the belief that when a certain congressional district or a State elects a Democrat one time and a Republican another by a small margin of ballots, the minority groups are responsible for the result.

Consequently, as predictably as night follows day, we are confronted again in this election year with the peculiarly American sport of claiming at political rallies, at fund-raising banquets, and in political propaganda pronouncements that this country does not admit a sufficient number of immigrants of one or another nationality.

We do not admit enough Greeks, they say, or enough Chinese. Not enough Italians or Rumanians or Portuguese. We should admit more people from India, more from Indonesia, more from Pakistan, or from Iran.

If we ask how many we should admit, the answer is always the same cry—more. And if we ask more of whom, it turns out that the speaker always means more of the people of that national group which the immigration auctioneer is addressing at that particular moment.

All right then, 5,000, 50,000? No. Sixty thousand? Or that part of the number of immigrants which another nationality has not sent to this country? No. Still not enough; and around and around we go.

And now this quadrennial numbers lottery is on again. The irresponsible, lusty auction has started already this year, exactly as we heard it in 1952 and in 1948—just as we heard it earlier, and in between the presidential election years as well.

The auction is being conducted in the usual uninhibited manner by the presidential aspirants, by governors facing election, by Senators whose terms are about to expire, and by some of my colleagues in the House of Representatives. It is being carried on by all their assistants and helpers, and by all the professional immigrant-handlers who make a living as paid servitors of various social, religious and charitable agencies which have made a crude business out of the truly noble and humanitarian task of assisting the immigrant.

At the risk of losing some popularity contests within my own political party as well as in my congressional district, I have long ago refused to look upon immigration as a means of winning friends abroad and political support at home.

To me, immigration is first and foremost a matter of the national welfare and national security.

The volume and the type of immigrants coming to the United States must, in my opinion, be predicated solely on unbiased and impartial findings as to how many we should admit and whom we should admit. Findings that are scientific and not political.

The quantity and the quality are of equal importance, and the interest of the American people must be the sole and exclusive yardstick.

Immigrants entering the United States are entering into the bloodstream of the Nation. It is like an injection into the bloodstream of a human being. It can be beneficial to him, increasing his strength and his vitality. But, if the injection is one of improper quality or improper quantity—it could be fatal.

THE PAST

A comprehensive picture of our current problems cannot be presented without an outline of the historical background of American immigration.

From the first settlement of the North American colonies to the end of the Revolutionary War in 1783, immigration to the New World was regulated not by the colonists but by the governments of Europe. The interest of the European ruler was enhanced by the size of the population of his domain. The more abundant the labor force, the greater his profits and the more gold that accumulated in the royal coffers. Consequently, all European rulers tried to prevent the exodus of their subjects, the peons, who were already then attracted by the magnificence of the wide open land and the opportunities beckoning from across the seas.

The new settlers on this side of the Atlantic deliberately encouraged immigration. Here, more people meant more producers, more consumers, and more wealth to be extracted from the newly acquired soil and—last but not least—more people meant increased safety of life and property.

It is estimated that in 1640, the population of the North American colonies numbered 25,000 people and by 1700, it had risen to 200,000. It took another 50 years to bring the population figure to the first million.

When the Articles of Confederation were adopted in 1777, the population of the Thirteen Colonies was well over 3 million, and the first census taken in 1790 put it at 4 million. About two-thirds of the white population were of English, Scotch, and Welsh origin; about one-third were Dutch, French, German, Scandinavian, Spanish, and Portuguese.

Except for a short-lived restrictive period created by the alien and sedition law of 1798, immigration flowed into the United States unfettered by any legislation. The vast growth of the new American economy, its progression to the limitless frontiers of the West and the ready acceptance of the newcomer by the thriving communities—already established—exerted an increasing attraction on poverty-stricken Europeans in the countries devastated by the Napoleonic wars. Recurring famines and the great industrial revolution resulted in increased population pressures and caused a gradual relaxation of the restrictive attitude of the European rulers who suddenly reversed themselves and began to encourage emigration. As a consequence, the first official record of arriving immigrants established in 1820 indicated that the population of the United States had jumped to almost 10 million persons.

By that time, public opinion, both in Europe and in America, became aroused by disturbing reports of appalling conditions on vessels carrying immigrants on their transatlantic journey. Thousands of them were crowded among the horrors of the dreaded steerage space where they died of hunger, thirst, and disease. In 1819, a law was enacted in the United States limiting the number of passengers that a ship could carry and prescribing the minimum amount of water and food that had to be aboard. The master of every ship reaching our shores had to report the number of passengers he had brought and their personal data, such as age, sex, occupation, and country of origin. Thus originated the first immigration statistics in the United States.

But, except for these efforts to humanize transportation of immigrants, no attempt at regulating immigration was made during the first part of the 19th century.

The first legislative enactment which may be considered as relating to the quality of immigrants was passed in 1863. It prohibited Americans from carrying on the trade in Chinese coolies. Later laws, still qualitative in nature, established rules for the exclusion of immoral persons, paupers, and criminals.

A tremendous influx of Chinese immigrants after the discovery of gold in California prompted the enactment of the first Chinese exclusion law in 1882. That trend of legislation continued, as witnessed by the enactment, in 1885, of a restrictive immigration measure aimed at prohibiting the importation of cheap labor from abroad.

A few years later, in 1891, the Congress excluded insane persons, persons likely to become public charges, felons, feeble-minded persons, polygamists, persons convicted of crimes involving moral turpitude excepting, however, persons convicted of political offenses.

The ethnic pattern of our immigration began to change in the last two decades of the 19th century. Around the year 1890, there appeared for the first time an appreciable number of immigrants from eastern and southern Europe. They came from the Balkans, from Italy, and from Russia, where the czarist persecution of Jews began to drive them out in ever-increasing numbers.

These changes in the immigration pattern continued until after World War I: While in the decade of 1871 to 1880, almost 74 percent of the immigrants came from northern and western Europe, and only 7 percent hailed from southern and eastern Europe, in the decade of 1901 to 1910 only 22 percent of the immigrants came from northern and western Europe while immigrants originating in southern and eastern Europe contributed up to 71 percent of the new arrivals.

It was about that time that the Congress turned its attention from qualitative restrictions to quantitative restrictions. The first law establishing a ceiling on the number of immigrants—a quota—was enacted in 1921. The second quota law was passed in 1924 and remained in effect with very little change until the enactment of the present law in 1952. The 1924 act was the one that established the much discussed national origin system, a system based on the allocation to every national group of as many immigrants as that national group had contributed to the population of the United States as of 1920.

THE WALTER-M'CARRAN ACT

The 1952 law, commonly referred to as the Walter-McCarran Act, is a comprehensive codification of over 148 laws that were on our statute books when we first began a study of our immigration and naturalization problems in 1947.

We had before us then a hodge-podge of antiquated, and piecemeal immigration and

naturalization laws. They had been often amended, but never codified. They were shot through with loopholes, inequities, ambiguities, and outright inconsistencies. There were discriminatory statutes excluding Japanese, Indonesians, Koreans, and other Orientals. There were laws prohibiting the naturalization of large groups of people permitted to remain in this country forever in an alien status. There were unreasonably strict rules under which no member of a subversive organization, however thoroughly reformed, could remain in this country and become a United States citizen. We were admitting alien wives of our citizens outside of the quotas but we were denying such privileges to the husbands of American girls. The wives of lawfully residing aliens were treated differently from the husbands of females who were admitted lawfully. There was no provision under which brothers and sisters of United States citizens could be placed in a preferential position under the immigration quota. There were no provisions under which even the most highly skilled alien technician, engineer, doctor, or nurse, could come even when urgently needed in this country.

We corrected all of those inequities in the Walter-McCarran Act. All countries of the entire globe were granted—without discrimination—immigration quotas under a formula equally applicable to all areas regardless of the color of the skin or the shape of the eyes of its inhabitants.

At the same time, the Walter-McCarran Act made it infinitely easier to rid this country of foreign-born subversives, criminals, racketeers, narcotic peddlers, professional gamblers, and aliens who have surreptitiously entered this country.

These—briefly—are the main achievements of the law about which there has been so much heat and so little light generated.

DISPLACED PERSONS AND REFUGEES

I am stating my views on immigration frankly and openly because I do not have to defend my record in this matter. During the last decade, since 1945, to be exact, immigration has been one of the major subjects of my activities nationally and internationally.

The guns had hardly stopped smoking when I moved with the American army of liberation into the infamous concentration camps in Europe which nazism had left as monuments of everlasting shame. I was one of the first Americans to see the wretched survivors of Nazi bestiality. I saw Hitler's victims anticipating with hope an opportunity to start a new life in a free land and I saw them committing suicide when forced to return to the lands where Hitler's former ally, Stalin, was busy continuing his program of enslavement and mass murder.

I am rather proud to point to my work on the laws which, since 1945, have brought to the United States almost half a million displaced persons who are now well integrated into our life, and who have caused but a few instances of disappointment.

Let us not forget that this country alone took one-third of all the displaced persons left in Europe by Hitler's reign of terror and Stalin's postwar conquests. We took one-third; yet we have only 6 percent of the land area of the world. It was certainly a little more than what is referred to as "a fair share."

I believe that the record will bear me out when I say that the success of our own national resettlement effort undertaken under the displaced persons laws of 1948, and of 1950, is, in part, attributable to my own activities in Washington, in Germany, and in Geneva, Switzerland.

More than that—and at the risk of exposing myself to the accusation of immaturity—I want to mention briefly that the erection of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration is similarly the result of my personal efforts.

This organization which we set up at Brussels, Belgium, in December 1951, has so far moved to happier lands almost half a million people who had no opportunities of making a livelihood and bringing up their children in the war-ravaged overcrowded countries of Europe. It is good to see that the Committee which had 16 nations as its members at the start, has grown into an efficiently functioning organization with a membership of 26 independent nations. We keep the Committee outside of the United Nations in order to prevent any Soviet interference and we excluded from it any nation under Communist domination.

Australia, Canada, Argentina, and other South American countries have cooperated splendidly with the United States and with the immigrant-sending European countries in the furtherance of the Committee's aims. With the assistance of my colleagues who serve on congressional committees handling foreign affairs and appropriations, I intend to continue my work in behalf of that useful organization.

I now intend to insist, both in Washington and in Geneva, that the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration undertake a determined and sustained effort designed to explore and open up new vast areas of South America and central and southern Africa for the benefit of European migrants who should be resettled in larger numbers on farmlands and not in congested industrial areas.

To bring the unskilled surplus European manpower and families to unsettled lands where they could engage in agriculture, would serve a double purpose. In addition to providing the migrants with new opportunities, it will increase food production for the ever hungry and now increasingly hungry world.

EXPLOSION OF HUMAN FERTILITY

Let me digress here for a moment and give you an idea of what is going on in the field of human fertility—a marvel that has a decisive import on our immigration problems.

According to statistical data placed at my disposal by experts from the Population Reference Bureau in Washington, D. C., the world is faced today with a true explosion of human fertility. Every morning there are 95,000 new mouths to feed. Every second 1 person dies, and 2 are born. The world's population is growing infinitely faster than the food supply produced by the globe's good earth.

Japan with a land area about equal to the State of Montana has 88 million inhabitants. In order to realize the overcrowding of Japan, one would have to imagine one-half of the population of the United States squeezed into Montana.

Communist China has 500 million people. That is one-fourth of the world's population. If the present birth rate continues in India, coupled with the decreasing death rate, that country will have 450 million people by 1970. The population of our neighbor to the south, Mexico, has increased by 30 percent in the last 20 years, and the population of Mexico is still growing so fast that at the current rate of growth Mexico's present population of 30 million will jump to 60 million in less than two decades.

And now a quick look at our own population picture. According to figures supplied by the Bureau of the Census, the population of the United States on April 1, 1956, was 167,440,000. This figure represents an in-

crease of over 16 million, or 10.8 percent, since April 1, 1950, the date of the last national census. Since 1950 immigration has contributed 1,700,000 to our population increase. Over 4 million babies were born in the United States in 1955. In comparison, births in 1940 numbered 2,800,000 babies.

Statisticians and economists of the Population Reference Bureau maintain that the increase of our population is entirely out of proportion with the rate of accumulation of capital in our country. They say that we are not earning enough capital to expand our production facilities, our housing, our schools, and our highways, so as to accommodate the future generations of our own citizens.

One glance at the world's population picture and the picture reflecting the increase of our own population leads to one inescapable conclusion: Immigration into the United States has long ceased to be a solution to the problem of crowded humanity. The only solution is a bold concerted effort to increase food production on the still virgin continents of the southern hemisphere coupled with an enlightened attempt to limit the uncontrolled increase in the total number of inhabitants of the globe. To pile up more people on top of an expanding native mass of people seeking employment and a decent living in the countries with a population density similar to ours, is worse than folly. It is clearly an invitation to disaster.

THE PHONY REFUGEE LAW

Having told you how proud I am of the part I played in helping to resettle displaced persons and refugees, I want to refer to another legislative enactment with which I had much to do—mostly opposing it. What I have in mind is the much talked about, the deceptively labeled Refugee Relief Act of 1953. The refugee relief law under which no relief was granted to refugees.

I have on many occasions called that law—a "phony" and I still use the same word to describe it. It was a fraudulent gesture of brazen political hypocrisy. For all its purported humanitarian aims the law, rammed down the congressional throat by a new administration seeking popularity which it lacked, is a crudely concocted piece of old-fashioned pork-barreling on international and national level.

Under that law refugees were created as a matter of pure legislative fiction writing. Real refugees were overlooked. Large numbers of nonquota immigrant visas were arbitrarily allocated to certain countries. The allocations were made entirely out of proportion to any acceptable economic or demographic standards or equitable humanitarian considerations. I believe that the numerical visa allocations of the 1953 act are simply in direct proportion to the strength of the political minority lobbies on Capitol Hill and at the White House.

I opposed this inequitable 1953 law, but having been outvoted in the subcommittee over which I now preside and in the committee of which I am the ranking member, I have undertaken on the floor of the House a little salvage operation. I submitted a total of 11 amendments permitting United States citizens to bring to this country their close relatives because even they, the relatives, just as the genuine refugees, were overlooked by the sponsors and pushers of the phony Refugee Relief Act. All the sponsors and the pushers of the 1953 law were interested in was but one thing—getting in good standing with the strong big-city pressure groups.

However, the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 has served at least one good purpose. It provided a perfect demonstration of what happens when immigration visas are distributed—"passed around" would be a better way

of saying it—by politicians instead of mathematicians. It provided the strongest argument against any departure from the present equitable, mathematical formula of distribution of the annual immigration quota in accordance with the national origins of those immigrants who fashioned the fundamental legal and social concepts upon which this Republic has been built and upon which it stands.

As you know, it is this fair, nondiscriminatory method of distributing our annual immigration quota that is under the sharpest attack by the leaders of special interests.

I will resist that attack. We all must resist it just as we would resist a foreign invasion. Yes, invasion—and I shall attempt to convince you that the word I use is not just a figure of speech.

FIGURES TELL THE TRUTH

The participants of the immigration numbers lottery say all over this country—and, indeed, have unfortunately advertised that brazen lie all over the world—that under the present immigration laws, access to this country has been curtailed, if not well nigh closed.

Let us look at the figures rather than listen to the chant of the auctioneers. In the fiscal year of 1955, we have admitted 858,736 aliens, of which 237,790 have come as immigrants to dwell among us for the rest of their lives and to bring into the world native-born American citizens. The corresponding number for the previous fiscal year, 1954, is 774,790 aliens admitted, of which 208,177 were immigrants coming to this country for permanent residence. Going back to the preceding years, the figures indicate a lesser number of aliens admitted to the United States, but looking at the figures for the current fiscal year and even disregarding those that come under special legislation, it is obvious that as the years pass, our annual intake grows larger and larger. It is quite possible that during the fiscal year 1957, possibly even in 1956, we will pass the one million mark of aliens admitted to this country temporarily or permanently.

You also hear from the immigration hucksters that we have closed our doors to foreigners who come to this country temporarily to transact business, to visit or to work here, or to study. Let us again take a look at the figures. In the fiscal year 1955, we admitted 26,288 foreign government officials, 68,696 foreign businessmen, 27,192 foreign students, well over 18,000 actors, artists, lecturers, writers, press, radio and television reporters, 16,077 foreign trainees who came to our colleges, hospitals, laboratories and similar institutions. In addition to these, an imposing total of 332,394 persons came here to visit. Each of the figures which I have just cited represents a 10 to 20 percent increase over the preceding year which in turn represented a similar increase over the fiscal year 1953.

You have also heard much about the "inadequacy" of our total immigration quota. The truth is that due to the extremely liberal treatment we accord under the existing law to natives of the independent countries of the Western Hemisphere and to all wives, husbands, and children of American citizens—regardless of race, color and place of birth—our annual immigration quota has become but a basic premise from which we operate. Nonquota immigration represents almost double the number of immigrants which we admit under the quota.

In the fiscal year 1955, we admitted 82,232 immigrants under the quota and 155,558 immigrants outside the quota. Of the latter only 29,002 came under the Refugee Relief Act.

The numerically unrestricted nonquota immigration is rising constantly. Here are

the figures. In 1951 we admitted 49,170 as nonquota immigrants; in 1952—71,273, in 1953—86,259, in 1954—114,079, and in 1955—155,558 nonquota immigrants.

It is safe to predict that in the current fiscal year, we will pass the 200,000 mark of nonquota admissions.

What little bearing the alleged inadequacy of our immigration quota has on the actual number of those who come to this country, is best illustrated by one example. You have heard much about the immigration quotas for the people of Asia. What you probably have not heard is the fact that during the last fiscal year, well over 2,000 Chinese and 2,489 Japanese came to the United States as nonquota immigrants, although the quota for Chinese persons is 105 and Japan's quota is 185. Thus, nonquota immigration from these two countries exceeds the annual quota 10 to 22 times.

THE MEXICAN INFLUX

The most remarkable increase in the number of immigrants coming outside the quota is immigration from Mexico. This is reflected in the amazing increases of 128, 347, and 525 percent, for 1953, 1954, and 1955, respectively, over the annual average of the years between 1946 and 1952. In other words, we are admitting now annually six times as many nonquota immigrants from Mexico as we were admitting in any earlier fiscal year prior to the enactment of the present immigration law.

The great increase in Mexican immigration in the last 2 years is caused to a large extent, undoubtedly, by the closing of our southern border to illegal entrants, which had assumed the alarming total of over 1 million in the fiscal year 1954 alone. In the first instance, thousands of Mexicans who had married American citizens and had American citizen children were living as respected members of their communities despite their original illegal entries. Many of these returned voluntarily to Mexico in the face of the Immigration and Naturalization Service drive for the purpose of obtaining immigration visas, passing inspection, and reentering this country in order to pursue the road toward American citizenship.

Others who had repeatedly entered the United States illegally in the past now faced the necessity of making a legal entry into this country, which includes the method of obtaining an immigration visa for permanent residence. The latter class is swelled by the present operation of the Mexican bracero program under which, except for a small percentage of individuals, the two Governments concerned have not established a mutual system whereby the recontracting and reemployment from year to year of a bracero can be assured. We know that a bracero wants to come to this country and earn American dollars. If both Governments can agree on a method to stabilize the Mexican labor force and if the bracero is assured that he will be able to come to this country for an unlimited number of times to work, I am certain that he will be content to stay in Mexico and remain a Mexican citizen.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service is now engaged in a unilateral operation seeking to achieve this desirable result. Under that system the bracero is inspected, reports concerning him are screened, and if he is found acceptable and satisfactory in all respects, including from the security standpoint, he receives a laminated identification card I-100. This is issued to him with the hope that he will again be selected by his Government the following year for agricultural work in the United States.

Recent reports have been received that in one locality a group of aliens on a farm endeavored to foment unrest among the braceros employed there. None of the suspected subversive aliens in this group was in possession of the laminated identification card.

Similar instances have occurred in the past. It is obvious that the protection to the United States which the identification card provides against entries of such aliens, who have infiltrated the bracero program for ulterior or sinister purposes, is essential in the interest of national security.

The Department of State informed me just a few days ago that nonquota visas issued to Mexican nationals will increase this year by 693 percent above the 1946 to 1952 level. This means that we will admit seven times as many Mexican immigrants as we admitted in any single year before the present immigration law became effective.

In 1 single workday, our consuls in Mexico are issuing a peak of 324 visas. This simply means that if our consuls in Mexico work 8 hours a day—allowing a few minutes for a coffee break or a chat with the staff—they are issuing in Mexico 1 immigration visa every minute. However, they are also busy issuing visas to Mexican visitors, and in the last fiscal year they were doing that at the rate of 76,870 visas per year, plus approximately the same number of border-crossing cards, and plus 367,461 cards to Mexican agricultural workers coming to this country.

It would take too long and it would be too tedious to burden you with more figures, but as you may readily visualize, the increase in the number of entries from Mexico—lawful entries only, mind you—reflect a truly vertiginous rise. A graphic chart which the Department of State sent to my office the other day depicts immigration from Mexico in an almost vertically rising line.

What I have not seen as yet is a graphic chart which could reflect in a similarly rising line a like increase in our school facilities, available job opportunities, housing, and four-lane highways.

THE EISENHOWER PROPOSAL

Now, despite all the facts which I have just presented to you, we find President Eisenhower coming before the Congress and recommending, in a message dated February 8, 1956, that the volume of annual immigration intake be considerably increased, possibly trebled.

First, President Eisenhower proposed that we accept the census of 1950 as a new basis for the allocation of annual quotas. That proposal if enacted into law, would by itself mean that our present annual quota of 154,657 immigrants would be increased to 220,000 annually.

Second, in addition to recommending an increase in the total annual quota, President Eisenhower recommends that quota numbers not used by countries to which they are originally allocated, would be made available for use elsewhere. This proposal, if enacted into law, would mean that at all times, all of the annual quota will be actually used although right now, due to the fact that Great Britain, Ireland, Germany, Switzerland, Sweden, Belgium, and a few other countries do not provide a sufficient number of immigrants, there is seldom more than 60 percent of the total quota used in any single fiscal year.

Third, the President recommends that we wipe out the so-called mortgage imposed on about a dozen immigration quotas for the purpose of deducting from the annual arrivals a prorated number of displaced persons already admitted to this country. This would have a net effect of adding about 8,000 immigrants annually.

Fourth, the President does not recommend any change in the present very liberal provisions under which immigrants are admitted outside of the quota.

If we add these figures together, we see that the President's proposal will have the net effect of increasing our present annual immigration intake by well over 100 percent,

and this estimate does not take into consideration the possibility of a further increase in the nonquota immigration from Mexico. If we consider this, too, it is obvious that what President Eisenhower is really advocating is a trebling of our annual immigration. Mr. Brownell, the Attorney General, admitted it in his testimony before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

There is another consideration involved in President Eisenhower's proposals. If we heed his advice regarding the change of the census base and if we continue to follow the same course of action after the census of 1960 is taken and again after the census of 1970, I believe that it would be entirely safe to assume that by, say 1980, we will have much difficulty making ourselves understood in the English language in some parts of this country.

The distribution of immigrants in the United States represents a growing problem. According to a report prepared at the request of the great statesman who is now the Governor of the State of New York, 33 percent of all immigrants entering under the 1953 law remain in New York and according to other reports, as many as 75 percent of all aliens in this country reside in 9 States out of the 48. When the Immigration and Naturalization Service reviewed the postcards received in 1955, under the alien address reports program, they found that all but 20 percent of the resident aliens live in the following States in this order: New York, California, Texas, Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Ohio.

Do not overlook, please, that the most recent figures released by the Department of Labor place—with the exception of California and Texas—all the areas affected with the highest figures of unemployed in exactly those States.

SOME FOOD FOR THOUGHT

Is it wise to permit at the present time the entry of well over half a million immi-

grants annually? I do not believe that it would be advisable to embark upon such a venture without having first a good look at both the domestic and the international ramifications of such a decision.

The United States is today the richest country in the world. Our standards of living are undoubtedly the highest in the world with the possible exception of but one country—and that one, Switzerland, is a country practicing the most restrictive immigration policy in the entire world.

With the population growth on the rampage all over the world and with the ensuing lowering of standards of living in the overcrowded countries of Europe and Asia, in the absence of any sustained effort on the part of most countries to have their food production increased and also their industrial capacity, the favorable conditions prevailing in our country have upon the hungry and unemployed masses the effect of a magnet placed near a heap of steel shavings.

Obviously, millions and millions of people are attracted by American prosperity and the opportunities which it offers. It is unfair to blame anyone for wanting to come to our shores, but is it wise to create in this country a problem of unassimilable surplus population on top of the problems created by our fast rising birth rate? Is it wise to bring in more people before we arrange our economy so as to take care of the present 3 million average additional citizens born in this country every year? I have no doubt that the United States has ceased to be what international migration experts call an area of resettlement.

Of course, we can afford to extend our hospitality to a sizable number of victims of totalitarian persecution. We can well live up to our tradition of opening the doors of the land of the free to people who love freedom and want to remain free. Many of those have already joined forces with us in our struggle for survival which we are waging against the cunning attack of a godless

conspiracy. Many more want to come to our shores in their quest for asylum. We shall welcome them, although we would expect other free nations to do likewise, and we would expect that they stop insisting that we take once again an unproportionate share of political refugees.

It is also true that we can afford to permit immigrant families to be united and to bring their closest relatives. The present immigration law has been written with that thought ever present in the minds of its authors.

But—we must resist with courage and determination the attempt to convert this country into a disorganized, multilingual, overcrowded dumping ground for the unwanted rejects of the rulers of those countries who selfishly refuse, or neglect, to cope with the problem of their own fast growing population. We must tell those governments that after having spent approximately \$50 billion of our taxpayers' hard-earned money to rehabilitate their lands, we would expect them to provide employment and food, to provide improved farmland and modernized industry for their own people instead of conveniently, yes, brutally, seeking to simply "get rid" of them and "send them to America."

Overcrowded and impoverished, torn apart internally by conflicting ideological concepts of uprooted immigrants swarming across our sea and land borders in excessive numbers, the United States could not maintain its present position in the world. The United States will be unable to stay strong, to remain the bulwark of liberty, the standard bearer of the free world and humanity's last reservoir of spiritual and material strength able to repel the onslaught of the atomic age Huns. We must resist the invasion in our own interest as well as in the interest of those who need our assistance.

This Nation cannot afford to play the immigration numbers game. The stakes are too high.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, June 4, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rabbi Samuel J. Fox, Lynn, Mass., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord, our God and God of our fathers: In this great hall of decision, where the fate of the many lies in the hands of the chosen few, do we assemble to seek out Thy divine wisdom in the course of human deliberation. Great is our task in this thermonuclear age, when man has assembled such great powers of destruction. Heavy is our responsibility in an era of shifting values when man is questioning the validity of tradition. Through this haze of confusion and misunderstanding have we been selected to steer the ship of legislation toward the port of decision.

Help us, O God, to turn our sails of destiny into the winds of Thy spirit so that we may navigate safely through storms of disagreement into the sunny waters of harmony. In a sea of chaos help us to chart the course of order. Amongst waves of fear help us to find the lane of security. Against gales of threat

help us to hold a steady vessel of promise.

From the shores of faith help us to sail for the land of fulfillment. From the bridge of courage help us to sight the landmark of hope. Through the ocean of care help us to find the harbor of peace.

For Thou, O Lord, art the Captain of Providence. Under Thy colors do we sail, and Thy good will do we seek. Help us on this voyage of eternity for the sake of a better world, a satisfied humanity, and a peaceful civilization. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 4, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 4, 1956, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 460. An act to amend section 4482 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U. S. C. 475), relating to life preservers for river steamers;

S. 743. An act to authorize biennial inspection of the hulls and boilers of cargo vessels, and for other purposes;

S. 1378. An act to clarify and consolidate the authority to require the establishment, maintenance, and operation of aids to maritime navigation on fixed structures in or over navigable waters of the United States;

S. 1790. An act to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize more liberal propelling power allowances in computing the net tonnages of certain vessels;

S. 1791. An act to amend section 3 of the act of April 25, 1940 (54 Stat. 164), relating to the lights required to be carried by motorboats;

S. 1970. An act for the relief of Kim Bok-soon and Anke Naber;

S. 2151. An act to provide for the segregation of certain funds of the Fort Berthold Indians on the basis of a membership roll prepared for such purpose;

S. 2562. An act to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended;

S. 3315. An act to amend section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; and

S. 3524. An act to give effect to the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries signed at Washington September 10, 1954, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting